U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

PB-256 348

Improving State Solid Waste Management Programs (With Addendum & Appendix)

Environmental Protection Agency

1972

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. Report No. EPA-SW-74.of

2.

3. Recipient's Accession No. PB-256 348

4. Title and Subtitle
Improving State Solid Waste Management Programs
(with Addendum and Appendix)

5. Report Date 1972

6.

7. Author(s) T. Edger, and J. Roat

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address
Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D. C.
Office of Solid Waste Management Programs

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address

13. Type of Report & Period Covered

14.

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts

This report presents statistics on the funding of solid waste planning grants to individual states through the fiscal year 1971. A summary of the findings of this program for improving state solid waste management programs is included.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

*Solid waste disposal,
*Management planning,
*Government policies,

Research management,
National government,
State government,
Local government,
Regulations,
Cost analysis,
Refuse disposal,
Statistics,
Financing.

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group 13 B

18. Availability Statement
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Virginia 22161

19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED

20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages 143

22. Price 6.00/2.25

236061

002205.

PB 256 348

IMPROVING STATE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

(with Addendum and Appendix)

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

143

IMPROVING STATE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

with Addendum and Appendix

This publication (SW-74.of) was written

by T. EDGAR, Engineer, and J. ROAT

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
1972

ADDENDUM

Improving State Solid Waste Management Programs

The issue study "Improving State Solid Waste Management Programs" begins on Page i. The research necessary for this study covered our planning program through fiscal year 1970. The report was written June 30, 1970. This addendum brings this issue study up to date through fiscal year 1971.

Since the first study of Solid Waste Planning Grants, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has become operational, and the Bureau's name has changed to the Office of Solid Waste Management Programs. The Environmental Protection Agency consolidated federal programs to control air and water pollution, solid wastes, pesticides and radiation into a new administrative agency, which has a regulatory emphasis.

In the past year the number of states with solid waste management programs has increased from 42 to 46. Eighteen state plans have been completed, previously there were nine, and eight more are in press. With the further completion of state plans and the reorganization of Federal and State environmental programs, the findings of the previous study are made current.

State governments have established new institutions to strengthen environmental controls and to demonstrate the State's commitment to pollution cleanup and natural resource protection. Presently fourteen States have established environmental protection agencies and three more have them pending. State environmental protection agencies increase the statue of the solid waste management programs and bring the problems in the States closer to the governors. Before State reorganization, solid waste management was often buried in the administrative structure of the health department and, in any case, had to compete with other health issues for staff-time and funds. But when solid waste management is incorporated into a State environmental protection agency the program is more likely to have full-time staff working only on this problem.

The planning section of the Division of Technical Operations, Office of Solid Waste Management, has been conducting an evaluation of State programs since January 1, 1971. In general, it has found that the States need greater numbers and types of personnel and funds for:

1. Training and Certification programs
2. Inspection and Enforcement
3. Technical assistance
4. Information systems
5. Improved legislation along with rules and regulations, operating criteria, and standards
6. Public information
7. Overall program support

Simply, most States are financially hurting, and they need assistance for the implementation of their solid waste management plans. In many States, the new environmental protection agencies provide the organizational structure for facilities and personnel to implement the State plans. This report still recommends that the Federal government provide planning support to State solid waste agencies on a continual basis including matching funds for implementation of the plans and other State program activities. The recommendation associated with alternative number two is being specifically examined by an EPA Task Force on Planning and Control Agency Grants to States.

A problem that surfaced in the study last year was that some States have not realized fully the role they should be playing in solid waste management planning. These States have put too much effort into collecting data and not enough time into the development of really effective plans. Whether a State does a good job planning solid waste management or not certainly depends on the competency of the people in that State, but it also depends on the guidance provided by the Federal government.

Since last year the Office of Solid Waste Management Programs has published a procedural manual, "Developing a State Solid Waste Management Plan" (PHS Publication No. 2031). This guide will supplement direct technical assistance to the States aiding them in completing their solid waste management plans. Also to provide better assistance to the States, this study has recommended that the measurement criteria for the evaluation of State planning grantees be revised to place a greater emphasis on the development under State plans rather than on the collection of data.

As the Federal government is combining its programs in Solid Waste Management, Water Quality and Air Pollution Control, many of the States are also bringing their pollution control programs together. Within the State environmental protection agencies, Solid Waste Management Planning can work closely with Water Quality and Air Pollution Control. For example, it is important that the treated quench water from incinerators meet water quality standards and that the gases from combustion meet air pollution control standards. While the Federal system of environmental grants and loans has had strengthening effects on the content of State programs, it has also been a strong influence on State governments to fragment their environmental management effort. This deficiency lends support for block environmental grants for planning and program activities. Block environmental grants would improve the perspective and handling of the whole environmental problem.

In the last year, State solid waste management planning grant programs were started in four States and completed in 17 others. State reorganizations have increased the stature of solid waste management offices, and thus the need for reliance on a developed solid waste management plan. When States implement their solid waste management plans they will have the basis for reducing solid waste pollution of the land, air, and water.

Improving State Solid Waste Management Programs

Introduction

The communities of this nation face the awesome task of providing for the collection, transportation, and sanitary disposal of over one billion pounds of solid wastes collected every day. Population densities are increasing to the point where urban, suburban, and rural areas are crowding each other at rapid rates. Land for proper waste disposal within the boundaries of each municipality is becoming more scarce and more expensive. Many communities are realizing that waste disposal requires long-range planning and cooperation with their neighbors. Those concerned recognize that each type of solid waste has its own inherent problems depending on the combustibility, salvability, disease-producing potential, and degree of organic and type of chemical content. No matter what disposal method is practiced, or where it is practiced, it must be such that it does not constitute a health or safety hazard or cause pollution of land, air, or water.

In addition, exhaustion of the nation's natural resource base is a very real possibility. Currently, a few industries recycle waste materials recognizing the long-term economic advantages. But this recognition has not significantly reversed the trend toward greater waste generation nor has it reduced the burden on communities across the nation that are responsible for the day-to-day management of solid waste materials.

Confronted with these problems, the Bureau of Solid Waste Management has identified two overall objectives:

1. To eliminate the deterioration of the nation's environment caused by the improper and inefficient management of solid waste.

2. To conserve the nation's natural resources by reducing the amount of material which must be ultimately disposed of as solid wastes.

This study examines the effectiveness of the Bureau's Solid Waste Planning Grants in assisting State planners to identify and resolve solid waste management problems. It evaluates our planning grants to determine how effective they are in achieving the above objectives. Planning dollars are compared to other Bureau expenses to attempt to put their effectiveness in perspective. An analysis is made of the planning grants in order to determine both their strengths and the weakness. The weakness will be treated in-depth in order to provide insights for improvements. This study will attempt to define the appropriate Federal role in State and interstate planning. It identifies the major issues and evaluates the courses of action open to the program.

Statement of the Issues

This study is concerned with improving State solid waste management programs. The State solid waste management plans are evaluated to determine the major problems in developing State plans, the major weaknesses of State plans, and any problem-solving resources that the Federal government can provide. This study also deals with the important issue of assuring that State solid waste management plans are implemented.

Scope of Study

This study is based on an analysis of the first ten plans developed, interviews with two State solid waste agencies, and the files and professional observations of the Planning Section of the Bureau of Solid Waste Management.

This "issue study" began as a Secretary of HEW priority and is the second such "issue study" made by the Bureau in accord with the policy laid down by the Office of Management and Budget in Bulletin No. 68-9, dated April 12, 1968. It is one in a series of evaluative studies being conducted by the Office of Program Development directed toward increasing the Bureau's effectiveness by examining its programs and activities.

Summary of the Planning Program

Prior to 1965 only California, Indiana, Mississippi, New York and Pennsylvania had operating solid waste programs. Congress recognized this deficiency and included under the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 the provision of grants to State and interstate agencies for up to 50 percent of the cost of developing solid waste plans. These grants are available to the particular State or interstate organization which has been designated or established as the sole agency for this environmental concern. The first of these planning grants, administered by the Bureau of Solid Waste Management, was awarded on June 1, 1966. To date, 45 States and territories, and five interstate agencies are the recipients of planning grants under the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

The prime objective of the State and interstate grants has been to foster comprehensive statewide or areawide programs in planning for the handling and disposal of solid wastes. In developing their plan, the grantees consider such factors as population growth, urban and metropolitan development, land use planning, water pollution control, air pollution control, regional disposal programs, economics, legal basis, and the management of solid wastes in general. In addition, the Act recognized that adequate planning cannot proceed without the provision of reliable data and information on current solid waste practices. Accordingly, in an effort to ensure uniform reporting, the Bureau of Solid Waste Management developed a set of survey forms, a manual of instructions for conducting the survey, and sample replies for completing the forms. To facilitate the acquisition and recording of the required information, these items were furnished to each State.

To aid in the completion of plans that sufficiently guide State and interstate solid waste agencies, the Bureau provides technical assistance in professional planning. This assistance includes the application of methods and techniques of planning, management, finance, and public administration. A procedural manual, "Developing a State Solid Waste Management Plan" (PHS Publication No. 2031), was published in 1970 and will be used to supplement direct technical assistance. The plan resulting from the program is designed to serve three main purposes:

*Provide an internal, technical, and policy guideline for carrying out the purposes of the State solid waste agency;

*Provide a State-directed framework of standards for local and regional solid waste management planning and for local and regional planning and implementation; and

*Provide a legislative support document for furthering the improved management of solid wastes in the State.

Exhibit I outlines the typical work schedule for State plan development.

Evaluation of State Planning Program

The overall effect of the State solid waste planning program has proven to be an excellent investment. The money invested in planning has increased the number of State solid waste programs from 5 to 42 and increased the number of full-time professionals engaged in these programs by over 900 percent. It is generally conceded that the solid waste problem is essentially a State and local responsibility. Thus, the Bureau's planning program has made an immense contribution by increasing the number of State solid waste offices and professional personnel to handle State solid waste management problems.

The total amount expended by the Bureau since 1966 for all activities totals $60,274,000. Of this, approximately ten percent, or six million dollars, has gone for State planning. Exhibit II outlines the funding history of the Bureau in relation to the amounts expended for planning. The six million dollars spent on planning contrasts with 15 million dollars spent on research grants and contracts, and 21 million dollars for demonstration grants. The technologies employed to deal with solid waste problems have scarcely changed over the past 10-20 years. There may be a threshold under which research and demonstration money does not provide the maximum effectiveness, just as perhaps there is a threshold over which additional planning money ceases to be so effective. The investment made so far in planning, however, has yielded definable worthwhile results. The staffed agencies resulting from planning funds have been responsible for what legislation has occurred, generating some public awareness of solid waste problems, providing needed planning data, and developing a planning process.

Looking at the results of the planning program more closely, the number of full-time permanent professionals working in State programs has increased from 13 in 1966 to 125 in 1970. Exhibit III breaks out these increases by State. Exhibit IV shows the increases in personnel that have occurred in States with planning grants subsequent to qualifying for the grant award.

The fact that the amount of full-time permanent personnel has increased by the amount it has is even more impressive when some of the inherent staffing problems are considered. These staffing problems have contributed to start-up problems and have caused some of the agencies to lose one to two years in the completion of the plan. These problems are:

1. Typically low State salaries.
2. Staff untrained in solid waste management.
3. No assurance that the program will be continued after the initial plan development.

Some of the States have temporarily avoided these staffing problems by letting contracts for the development of the plan. Salaries have improved quite slowly during the four years of the planning grant program. Most States, however, have sent members of their staffs to solid waste training courses for which planning funds have shared the cost. Of the 2,482 individuals attending one or more training branch solid waste courses, 330 were supported with planning grant funds.

Exhibit V summarizes an evaluation of each individual State planning grantee. Six factors were considered in arriving at the total rating: Completion of Statewide survey, staffing additions and upgrading, legislation efforts, development of written State plans, public relations and information efforts, and improvement of the solid waste agency stature. The method of rating was designed to encourage a balanced program among many necessary activities a State could conduct.

Exhibit VI is a summary of the quality of the State solid waste legislation and enforcement. The rating is based on the professional judgement of those familiar with State legislation and ranges from A to C with A being the best. The overall effect of the legislation must include a consideration of the quality of State rules and regulations and the enforcement of the legislation as well as the legislation itself.

An example of "A" legislation is Pennsylvania's Solid Waste Management Act (Act 241). This act is broad in its management and planning scope. A unique feature requires municipalities to submit solid waste management plans to the State for approval. Reimbursement of up to 50 percent is available to municipalities for the cost of preparing these plans.

Of course the poorest quality of legislation is no legislation at all. But Texas is an example of "C" rated legislation where if wastes are disposed of within 50 miles from where they are generated they are not subject to State laws. Because of the available space in Texas few wastes are transported great distances and consequently this legislation is not effective.

Kentucky is an example of "C" quality of enforcement of legislation. Kentucky law states that open dumps cannot receive annual permits and yet the State violates its own law by using open dumps in State parks.

When the overall evaluation of individual State planning grantees is compared to an evaluation of the legislation (see Exhibit VII), it is clear that there is a significant correlation. States with planning grants are four times more likely to have solid waste legislation than States without grants. Furthermore, States which received high planning evaluations in Exhibit V are more likely to have better solid waste legislation.

Exhibit VIII is a measure of the overall acceptance of the concept of State planning in State government. Exhibit IX is a correlation between this measure and the solid waste planning evaluation. There is no positive correlation except between those States that received outstanding ratings in both categories. This could mean that for the average State whether it has good or poor solid waste planning is more a result of the competence of that particular functional area or how well the Federal program has conducted its planning assistance activities. In other words, good solid waste planning does not just happen.

The only truly valid way to evaluate planning is to measure the effect it has had on solving the problem. The national survey of solid waste practices offers a good baseline from which to measure future progress. This survey was completed through the planning grant program and its influence in the development of State plans is probably why most plans are very good at gathering and depicting data. To measure progress against this baseline, the Bureau is developing a pilot-scale National Solid Waste Data Network. Implementation toward a full-scale National Solid Waste Data Network will begin in fiscal year 1972. This will provide a critically important tool to evaluate not only the planning program but all the other program activities as well.

Main Problems in State Plans

One of the major weaknesses of State planning is the preoccupation with the accumulation of data. Experience has shown that, although the data is worthwhile, the preoccupation with its accumulation has required large portions of the planning period leaving less time for the development of really effective plans. For example, Oregon, like many of the States, has assembled a 125 page report of which only seven pages outline a solid waste management plan. Thus, the document that is finally produced in most cases is very far from a plan. Instead, it is a collection of solid waste data and summary of current State practices. The plans almost never consider alternative courses of action, very seldom present any sort of strategy for a successful State role and neglect almost completely discussions of how much State money might be required to finance an appropriate State program. The failure to discuss dollars is in many cases political. Fiscally conservative State legislatures might turn off the solid waste program if it engaged in publicizing its financial needs. There is also a reluctance to consider the solid waste problem from a financial viewpoint at the local level. Other competing public services should be considered and financial problems and priorities should be discussed.

Most of the plans have placed primary emphasis on physical planning (i.e. sanitary landfill sites) rather than the comprehensive role a State agency should be involved in. Consideration given to the State role in providing technical assistance, solid waste training, regulation, and enforcement was meager if not altogether absent. Actually, the plans that many States have turned out have been solid waste disposal plans rather than solid waste management plans. This might be partly due to the bias toward physical planning, but on the whole reflect the narrow viewpoint of the solid waste problem that is still generally accepted. Thus, the plans are weak in that they do not include adequate consideration of all the activities which should be carried out in the State agency. It is clear that many States have not realized fully the role they should be playing in solid waste management.

The interstate plans that have been developed have all been done on contracts with consultants. Nine State plans (this represents about 20 percent of the State plans being developed) are being done with major reliance on consultants (see Exhibit X). The interstate plans had two major deficiencies--few permanent staff were attracted and the type of agency responsible for the interstate plan had no type of line authroity to implement the plan. Although loose relationships were established with operating agencies through the device of technical advisory committees, it was assumed that participants of these committees would implement the plan in their respective operating agencies.

Other problems and weaknesses in the present planning program are listed as follows:

**In the disbursements of funds, some States have received a disproportionate share of funds. Three States received 42 percent and six States received 55 percent of the total amount of funds available for State planning since 1966. This occurred because these few States were prepared to use the funds while many States were not. It is possible that more effort could have been spent in encouraging broader participation.

**Most of the planning documents are exceedingly wordy. Plans that are the wordiest are usually done by contractors trying to justify their fees.

**There has been almost no effort to encourage citizen participation in the planning process.

**There has been a weakness in the State planning process in working on and obtaining public acceptance for solid waste management.

**The reliance on consultants in State plan development has discouraged State agencies from adding staff and building a more permanent agency.

Alternatives and Recommendations

There are several major issues needing resolution concerning the solid waste planning program.

1. The amount and nature of future support to State solid waste planning agencies must be determined.

   Basically there are four alternatives:
   1. Continue to fund new and existing grants until completed. Place an absolute time limit of four years on support to any individual grantee and eventually phase out the program.
   2. Continue to fund new and existing grants until completed. After a maximum of four years support for overall plan development fund additional special in-depth planning studies--i.e. hazardous wastes, hospital wastes, or other special areas.
   3. Provide planning support to State solid waste agencies on a continual basis.
   4. Provide planning support to State solid waste agencies on a continual basis including matching funds for implementation of the plans and other State program activities.

Recommendation: It is the conclusion of this study that alternative four be followed. (It is possible that alternative four would require additional legislation to provide matching funds for the implementation of State plans.) Alternatives one and two are rejected primarily because our belief that planning is a continuing process. Planning grant support should continue to provide for the continuation of in-depth planning studies but even beyond that, State solid waste management plans must be updated periodically. Alternative three is rejected primarily because it does not take cognizance of the need to assure that State plans are implemented. The rationale for selection of alternative number four revolves around the basic question of what role each level of government should assume in the solution of our nation's solid waste problems. It is generally conceded that the real responsibility for solid waste lies with the State and local levels of government. Before the Federally sponsored State solid waste planning program the State's participation in these problems was almost non-existent and from an operational program standpoint is still extremely weak. The appropriate level of government, however, for much solid waste activity is at the State level. To insure a regional approach, the States should conduct strong and effective planning programs. Because each State's problems are a little different and because they are closer to the action, these agencies should be involved in providing technical assistance to local communities. Successful public relation programs to gain community support for solid waste management could best be handled at the State level. Finally, the States should involve themselves more in setting standards and in monitoring and enforcement activities both of which are preferable State level functions in the case of solid wastes.

If we would discontinue our planning support at this time, most of the progress that has been made in the establishment of State solid waste agencies and the building of professional State solid waste staffs would be wiped out. During the past five years, considerable progress has been made by State solid waste management programs. Programs have grown in staff and competence, legislation has been passed, and although measured improvements in solid waste management have come about, each State program now recognizes the formidable tasks that lie ahead. If the present rate of progress continues, effective and efficient solid waste management can result. It is, therefore, essential that planning support be continued and that additional program competence be built in State government through matching support for these activities. The development of a plan is only the beginning, some provision has to be made for its implementation. Furthermore, planning is not a one-shot project, it is a continual process that needs sustained effort to bring results. Thus, the States' role in solid waste management must be strengthened.

The kind of program to achieve this result would be similar to the program in the Federal Water Quality Administration for State program grant assistance which is provided for under Section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. FWQA presently spends 10 million dollars a year on this activity and has plans for an expanded program. The following chart summarizes the amounts estimated to be required to effectively support State planning and State program implementation.

	1971	1972	1973	1974
Planning	2.8*	3.8	6.8	6.8
Program Implementation	1.0	3.0	6.0	6.0
TOTALS	3.8	6.8	12.8	12.8

*These figures are expressed in millions of dollars and represent the Federal share in such a program. The Federal share has been assumed at 66 2/3 percent of total program costs.

It is anticipated that the State agencies would use the funds for planning as follows:

Data accumulations for planning, national survey up-dates, management information systems for solid waste planning.	30%
Assistance to local and regional planning groups.	20%
Special planning studies such as abandoned automobiles, industrial solid wastes, agriculture, pesticides, hospital wastes, radiological, and other hazardous wastes, and special studies on recycling.	30%
Actual plan formulation, updates and revision.	15%
Administration, reporting, and coordination with other programs and agencies.	5%

Funds for program implementation would be used by the State agencies to begin and/or supplement the much needed State activities in technical assistance, getting good solid waste legislation adopted, training, and enforcement.

Finally, it is recommended that when the program is established on a continual basis that these funds be distributed to the States according to a formula. This formula should take into account equally three factors: population, extent of the solid waste problem, and financial needs. This will prevent a few States from using up major portions of the available funds and will concentrate the planning dollars where they will have the most impact. Should a State not qualify for its allotment, that allotment should be divided between the remaining States according to the proposed formula.

2. Should solid waste planning be:

Alternatives

1. Included organizationally with comprehensive planning;
2. Included with block environmental planning grants (along with air and water);
3. Maintained separately from other functional planning programs?

Recommendation: There are obviously many aspects of the solid waste problem that are closely related to water and air pollution problems. Block environmental grants for planning and program activities would vastly improve the perspective of State activities. This combination program should be established when EPA becomes operational--care should be taken, however, to prevent the solid waste activity from being obliterated by the larger program in water and air. This might be achieved by breaking out a portion of the environmental block grant for allocation to categorical program areas. Thus, a minimum of activity in each area would be insured. In the interim period, the program should proceed as an individual categorical planning program.

3. Concerning the internal arrangement of the expanded number of BSWM planning personnel, should they:

   Alternatives
   1. Operate as done presently with BSWM planning personnel in Cincinnati working with the regional representatives;
   2. Be shifted permanently to the regions; or
   3. Report to the Chief of Planning in Cincinnati but for the most part work out of the regional offices?

   Recommendation: Permanent planning staff should be assigned to the regional offices. This is where professional competence should be located to most effectively help the State and local programs. Overall policy relating to the planning grant program should continue to be set by the Chief of Planning.

4. Concerning the decision on grant awards, should it be made by:

   Alternatives
   1. The regional representative;
   2. The regional representative, subject to approval by the Bureau Director; or
   3. A panel made up of BSWM senior staff?

   Recommendation: · The final decision on grant awards should be made by the regional representative with the concurrence of the Division Director responsible for setting national policy on the planning grant program. The Division Director would ascertain that funds were available and that overall policy and criteria are met. This would facilitate a coordinated effort to carry out Federal responsibilities in State and local planning. With the advent of local planning, regional planning, and expanded State planning, the management of this program will become extremely complex. The number of possible grantees will drastically increase and the problems of getting State, local, and regional agencies to work together will be formidable. In addition to the organizational issues, certain adminstrative policies should be decided.

5. Concerning the degree of Federal requirements that should be built into the future State planning and implementation program:

   Alternatives
   1. Priority program areas should be established by the

Federal program and adherence to these priorities will be required.

2. Priority problem areas should be established by the Federal program and adherence to these priorities should be a factor in the grant award decision.
3. No program requirements should be established as a condition for grant awards.

Recommendation: This study recommends that no major program requirements be established as a condition for grant awards. The State should allocate the resources and be judged only on how successful they have been in solving the problem. This would be in the spirit of revenue sharing as has been proposed by President Nixon and would put final responsibility for the program with the State.

6. Concerning the degree of State control over local funding and planning, the policy could be one of the following:

Alternatives

1. State should have no formal control over local planning.
2. Local planning grant applications and completed plans should be reviewed by the State agency. The State agency's recommendations will be a factor in the Bureau's decision.
3. The State agency should have veto power over local planning applications.

Recommendation: A policy should be established insuring a major role for the States in the Bureau's local planning program. This is essential if we are ever going to achieve effective State solid waste programs. If we short-circuit the States in this case, much of our successful efforts in creating viable State programs will be seriously hindered. For those States which have acceptable solid waste plans, it is recommended that they have major influence in the funding of local and regional planning. In rare circumstances only, should a local or regional grant be made over the State's objection. Effort should be made to involve the State agency's personnel as much as possible with local and regional planning programs.

Other Recommendations

It is the conclusion of this study that the following recommendations be followed:

**In the future administration of the State planning program, no planning should be done with consultants on contract. The objective of the State planning program is to encourage and strengthen the State agency so it can better perform its job. As noted above, the use of consultants discourages the addition of permanent staff to the solid waste agency and often the plan that is developed is shelved. It would be better to let the States struggle with their own planning, for in the long-run the competence will be in the agency where it is needed. For special studies to supplement the general planning program, consultants should continue to be allowed. These studies might be concerned with various hazardous wastes, abandoned automobiles, hospital wastes, or certain industrial wastes where special knowledge is needed and a full-time addition to the staff in that area would be uneconomic.

**The same problem will have to be met in the development of local and regional plans. If no restriction is placed on how consultants can be used for local and regional planning, a group of "solid waste" consultants will spring up and the communities are likely to be sold on a cook-book plan that is being sold with modifications to many different jurisdictions. Although this might not be totally useless, much more effectiveness could be achieved if it were done in-house. First, acceptance and implementation would be more likely and secondly, planning competence would be developed in each agency. A good example of what might happen if regional plans were done with consultants is the group of interstate planning grants already funded by the Bureau. The results of this investment have been marginal because these agencies had no line authority to implement their plans and because little permanent staff was attracted. All were done with consultants. To prohibit all consultants, however, would severely penalize the small communities who would never be able to attract the necessary competence in-house. It is, therefore, recommended that consultants be discouraged whenever possible. Top funding priority should be for those applicants doing the planning in-house. For applicants with populations greater than 100,000 people, a condition for the grant should be established (for those grantees desiring to plan on contract) insuring that one professional member of the staff be assigned full-time to work on plan development.

**Meaningful citizen participation is essential if State, areawide, and local agencies are to be responsive to the needs of their citizens. This is especially true in the area of solid wastes where the location of solid waste facilities and their management is often in the center of local politics. This means affording affected citizens timely notice of projects being proposed or the plans to be developed, opportunities to make known their views and to influence the shaping of the projects, plans, and decisions. It is recommended that a portion of the funds from the planning program be a permitted expenditure to support technical advisory groups and the citizens' view in the development of plans.

Conclusion

It is impossible to do an analysis of State planning without considering indepth the closely related planning problems at the local level. This study indicated what the appropriate State role should be in solving the solid waste problem. This could not be determined without considering both the Federal role and the local role. It is for these reasons that it would be very unwise to consider the State planning program as a separate and distinct effort. Care should be taken to insure that decisions made on the future program for solid waste planning reflect this understanding.

Finally, the State solid waste planning program and the proposed local and regional programs are stand-alone activities. They are not intended solely to be groundwork for future Federal grants in operational areas. This program is intended to give the State and local jurisdictions the impetus to fulfill their own responsibilities. The beginning of this endeavor is being completed in the State planning program. Additional support is critical to the achievement of this objective. The real dividends and results of this program have yet to be fully achieved.

Exhibit I

TYPICAL WORK SCHEDULE

The typical three-year work schedule for a State planning program is:

First-Year

1. Hire one or two professional staff members and one stenographer in addition to the project director. The project director is usually assigned to the project 100% of his time. Staff member's time assigned to the project is about 50%.

2. One of the first activities is to publicize the upcoming Statewide survey. This is usually the first attempt at a public relations activity.

3. The Statewide survey is undertaken and demands much of the staff's time either by its conducting the survey or its supervision.

Second-Year

1. The Statewide survey is continued. Many States finish the survey during the second year and proceed with analysis of the collected data.

2. Public relations activities become more sophisticated through issue of news releases, publication of newsletters, speeches by staff members, and dissemination of brochures.

3. Many States make their first attempt to draft solid waste bills and have them introduced in the legislature.

4. The States begin considering elements of their Statewide solid waste plans. About one-half the States draft plan outlines.

Third-Year

1. Survey data is further analyzed for identification of solid waste problems. Pertinent data is arrayed for inclusion in the State plan appendix or separate plan volume for data presentation.

2. Public relations activities continue. Some States develop slide shows. Newspaper publicity is more frequent and favorable. Many project directors and staff appear on radio, TV, and Statewide panels.

3. Legislative activities become more active. States which have succeeded in passing enabling legislation begin writing rules and regulations.

4. Development of the State plan now begins in earnest. However, most States only succeed in completing 25% to 50% of their plans during the third year. Plan completion usually occurs during a three to six month extension of the third year.

Exhibit II

Funding History of the Bureau of Solid Wastes Management*

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	Totals
Research	$1233	2972	3361	3826	3944	15,336
Grants	(853)	(1677)	(2261)	(2444)	(1944)	
Contracts	(380)	(1295)	(1100)	(1382)	(2000)	
Training Grants	150	350	443	486	490	1,919
Demonstration Grants	1989	5000	4744	5134	4650	21,517
PLANNING GRANTS	400	997	1467	1858	1500	6,222
Direct Operations (includes technical assistance)	562	2873	3342	3812	4691	15,280
TOTAL	4334	12,192	13,357	15,116	15,275	60,274
Planning Grants as Percent of Totals	9%	8%	11%	12%	10%	

Total dollars expended by the Bureau since 1966	$60,274
Total dollars expended on planning grants since 1966	6,222
Planning Grants as percent of total expended	10%

---

*All dollar figures are in thousands of dollars

Exhibit III

Total Full-Time Professional and Technical Personnel Employed in State Solid Waste Programs

Totals	1966	1970
Alabama	No planning grant	
Alaska	No planning grant	
Arizona	No planning grant	
Arkansas		2
California	3	4
Colorado		1
Connecticut		7
Delaware		1
Florida		3
Georgia		2
Hawaii		
Idaho		1
Illinois	No planning grant	
Indiana	2	4
Iowa	No planning grant	
Kansas		1
Kentucky		4
Louisiana		2
Maine		2
Maryland		4

Totals	1966	1970
Massachusetts		4
Michigan		2
Minnesota		3
Mississippi	1	3
Missouri		2
Montana		2
Nebraska	No planning grant	
Nevada	No planning grant	
New Hampshire		1
New Jersey		12
New Mexico		2
New York	3	8
North Carolina		1
North Dakota		1
Ohio		4
Oklahoma		2
Oregon		4
Pennsylvania	4	15
Rhode Island		1
South Carolina		4
South Dakota		1
Tennessee		
Texas		

Totals	1966	1970
Utah		1
Vermont		2
Virginia		3
Washington		4
West Virginia		5
Wisconsin	No planning grant	
Wyoming		
TOTAL	13	125

Exhibit IV

Increases in State Solid Waste Management Staffs after Federal Planning Assistance was Provided*

Professional	**Staff Increases**
100%**	+24
75-99%	+10
50-74%	+20
Technical	
100%	+21
75-99%	+ 3
50-74%	+ 3
Secretarial	
100%	+ 9
75-99%	+ 4
50-74%	0

Total dollars expended on State Personnel Budgets have increased from $1,635,800 to $2,894,200 in these States that have received Federal planning assistance.***

---

* The increases in staff referred to in this chart are calculated by totaling the staff as of July 1, 1970, in each State with a planning grant and subtracting from this the staff in the States when the agencies qualified for a planning grant. Figures apply to the forty-two State agencies that have received grants.

** Percent of time spent on solid waste activities.

*** The increases in dollars referred to in this chart are calculated by totaling the budgets as of July 1, 1970 for the 42 State grantees and subtracting the personnel budgets that enabled the State to qualify for the original grant.

Exhibit V

Current Ratings by Agency*

July 1, 1970

	Staffing	Public Relations	Survey	State Plan	Percent Completion	Legislation	Stature of Solid Waste Agencies	Total Rating
Arkansas	4.0	2.0	7.0	0.5	5	8.0	0.0	3.6
California	8.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	100	3.0	5.0	7.5
Colorado	4.0	9.0	8.5	8.5	90	8.0	3.0	6.8
Connecticut	9.0	8.0	9.0	8.5	90	6.5	3.0	7.3
Delaware	2.0	2.0	6.0	0.5	5	1.0	1.0	2.1
Florida	6.0	7.0	8.5	5.0	50	1.0	5.5	5.5
Georgia	8.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	30	1.0	6.5	5.6
Guam	7.5	7.5	7.0	5.0	50	3.0	4.5	5.8
Hawaii	3.0	3.0	9.5	9.0	95	1.0	3.0	4.8
Idaho	7.0	8.0	9.5	9.5	95	8.0	3.0	5.8
Indiana	5.0	5.0	7.5	0.5	5	8.0	1.5	4.6
Kansas	6.5	8.0	9.0	8.5	90	7.0	1.5	6.8
Kansas City Inter.				8.5	90			8
Kentucky	6.5	9.0	9.0	10.0	100	8.0	6.0	8.1

---

*Point rating is based on a 1-10 range with 10 as best.

	Staffing	Public Relations	Survey	State Plan	Percent Completion	Legislation	Stature of Solid Waste Agencies	Total Rating
Louisiana	1.0	2.0	9.5	9.0	95	1.0	0.0	3.8
Maine	6.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	30	1.0	1.5	4.6
Maryland	5.5	9.0	9.0	0.5	5	1.0	1.5	4.4
Md.-Va. Interstate				2.0	20			C
Massachusetts	1.5	6.0	7.0	0.0	0	1.0	1.5	3.0
Michigan	2.0	7.0	7.5	5.0	50	8.0	1.5	5.1
Minnesota	9.0	10.0	6.5	6.0	60	8.0	7.0	7.8
Mississippi	4.5	5.0	7.5	3.0	30	1.0	2.0	3.8
Missouri	6.0	8.5	9.0	2.0	20	1.0	5.5	5.3
Montana	6.0	7.5	9.0	9.0	95	1.0	5.5	6.3
Neb.-Iowa Inter.				10.0	100			B
New Hampshire	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0	1.0	1.0	1.0
New Jersey	7.0	8.5	9.5	9.0	95	6.0	7.0	7.8
New Mexico	8.5	8.0	7.0	3.0	30	8.0	3.0	6.3
New York	10.0	8.5	9.0	10.0	100	3.0	8.0	8.1
North Carolina	6.0	8.0	9.0	0.5	5	1.0	1.5	4.3
North Dakota	6.0	9.5	9.0	6.5	65	8.0	1.5	6.8
Ohio	5.0	5.0	7.5	4.0	40	8.0	1.5	5.1

	Staffing	Public Relations	Survey	State Plan	Percent Completion	Legislation	Stature of Solid Waste Agencies	Total Rating
O-K-I Interstate				5.0	50			C
Oklahoma	5.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	95	8.0	1.5	6.8
Oregon	9.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	100	7.0	1.5	7.6
Pennsylvania	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.5	90	9.0	6.0	8.8
Puerto Rico	5.0	3.0	9.0	6.0	60	1.0	1.5	4.3
Rhode Island	4.5	8.0	9.0	8.5	85	8.0	3.0	6.8
South Carolina	4.0	2.0	9.0	3.0	30	1.0	3.0	3.6
South Dakota	4.5	6.0	5.0	0.0	0	1.0	1.5	3.0
Tennessee	8.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	95	7.0	3.0	7.8
Tenn.-Ga. Interstate				9.0	95			C
Texas	3.0	2.0	9.0	5.0	50	8.0	1.5	4.8
Utah	4.5	6.0	5.0	0.0	0	1.0	1.5	3.0
Vermont	4.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0	8.0	4.0	3.0
Virginia	6.0	7.0	9.0	2.5	25	7.0	1.5	5.5
Washington	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	80	8.0	10.0	8.5
West Virginia	6.0	7.0	9.0	8.0	80	4.0	1.5	5.9
Wyoming	1.0	1.0	9.0	0.0	0	1.0	1.5	2.3

For statistical comparisons, the ratings of the State agencies are also expressed in letter grades:

A = total rating of 8.0 - 10.0 B = total rating of 6.0 - 7.9 C = total rating of 0.0 - 5.9

Exhibit VI

Evaluation Summary of State
Solid Waste Management Legislation*
July 1, 1970

Totals	Quality of State Legislation	Quality of State Rules and Regulations	Quality of Enforcement
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas	C	C	C
California			
Colorado	C	C	C
Connecticut	C	C	C
Delaware			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho	C	C	C
Illinois			
Indiana	C	C	C
Iowa			
Kansas	C	C	C
Kentucky	B	B	C
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan	C	C	C

Totals	Quality of State Legislation	Quality of State Rules and Regulations	Quality of Enforcement
Minnesota	B	B	B
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana	C	C	C
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	B	C	C
New Mexico	C	C	B
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio	C	C	B
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania	A	A	B
Rhode Island	B	B	B
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee	C	C	C
Texas	C	C	C
Utah			
Vermont	C	C	C
Virginia			

Totals	Quality of State Legislation	Quality of State Rules and Regulations	Quality of Enforcement
Washington	A	C	C
West Virginia			
Wisconsin	B	B	B
Wyoming			

---

*This evaluation was determined qualitatively with A being the highest rating and C the lowest.

A blank signifies no legislation, rules or regulations and, therefore, no enforcement.

Exhibit VII

Correlation of State Solid Waste Legislation with Evaluation of State Solid Waste Planning

Quality of Legislation Rating	Solid Waste Planning Rating			
	A	B	C	No State Planning Grant
A	2*			
B	1	3		1
C		7	7	
No Legislation	1	5	16	7

*Number of States that were rated A for legislation and A for planning.

Exhibit VIII

Evaluation of the Overall Status, Effectiveness, and Acceptance of the Concept of State Planning in State Government*

	A**	B	C	D	E	F	Total Points
Alabama	4	3	1	4	4	0	16
Alaska	2	1	3	4	4	2	16
Arizona	2	0	0	5	0	0	7
Arkansas	2	0	2	6	5	0	15
California	3	5	2	4	3	3	20
Colorado	5	7	2	4	7	3	28
Connecticut	5	2	6	6	1	5	25
Delaware	5	7	3	6	5	4	30
Florida	5	7	7	5	4	4	32
Georgia	7	6	6	7	6	2	34
Hawaii	5	7	7	5	4	5	33
Idaho	3	1	2	4	5	3	18
Illinois	1	3	3	3	6	2	18
Indiana	0	5	3	5	5	1	19
Iowa	6	6	8	4	6	3	33
Kansas	2	2	3	4	2	2	15
Kentucky	5	3	6	4	8	3	29
Louisiana	2	0	1	5	0	2	10
Maine	2	3	5	5	5	3	23
Maryland	5	7	8	6	6	5	37
Massachusetts	5	2	4	5	7	1	24
Michigan	6	1	4	4	4	3	22
Minnesota	7	2	5	6	6	4	30

	A**	B	C	D	E	F	Total Points
Mississippi	1	1	3	5	6	1	17
Missouri	4	2	7	5	7	5	30
Montana	4	1	3	4	6	5	23
Nebraska	4	1	3	5	2	3	18
Nevada	2	3	1	4	3	1	14
New Hampshire	2	2	1	5	1	0	11
New Jersey	3	5	4	7	7	1	27
New Mexico	5	3	8	5	8	4	33
New York	6	4	8	4	8	5	35
North Carolina	4	1	7	5	6	0	23
North Dakota	3	0	5	4	5	2	19
Ohio	1	0	0	6	3	0	10
Oklahoma	3	2	4	4	2	3	18
Oregon	6	5	4	3	4	0	17
Pennsylvania	4	6	4	5	6	1	26
Rhode Island	2	5	5	7	4	4	27
South Carolina	4	3	2	4	3	1	17
South Dakota	6	3	5	4	6	5	29
Tennessee	3	5	4	5	4	2	23
Texas	7	0	6	3	7	4	27
Utah	6	2	8	4	6	5	31
Vermont	5	3	5	6	4	5	28
Virginia	6	0	5	5	8	2	26
Washington	6	5	6	6	8	3	34
West Virginia	2	5	5	5	4	3	24
Wisconsin	5	1	5	7	3	3	24
Wyoming	3	2	4	4	6	2	21

* This is an interpretation of the findings reported by the Institute on State Programming for the 70's--Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

** A - Index of Gubernatorial Commitment
B - Index of Legislative Intent
C - Index of Legislative Branch Involvement
D - Executive Branch Involvement
E - Index of State Planning Agency Support Level
F - Index of State Planning Agency Performance

NOTE: The higher the number the better the rating.

Exhibit IX

Correlation of Overall Planning Ability and the Rating of State Solid Waste Planning Efforts*

	Overall State Planning Rating	
State Solid Waste Planning Rating	Above Average Rating	Below Average Rating
A	4	0
B	7	6
C	13	11

*This comparison includes only those States with planning grants.

Exhibit X

(July 1, 1970)
Summary Data on State Planning Grantees Comparing Total Dollars Awarded with
Changes in Personnel Budgets, Grantees Relying on Contractors, and Other Data

	Total Dollars Awarded*	Change in Personnel Budget since Grantee Qualified for Planning Grant*	States in which Grantee has relied heavily on Contractors to Develop Plan	State Solid Waste Planning Rating	Percent Completion of State Plan
TOTALS					
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas	39	-2		C	5
California	286	74		B	100
Colorado	89	13		B	90
Connecticut	206	93	Contract	B	90
Delaware	44	6		C	5
District of Columbia	137	46		B	95
Florida	64	11		C	50
Georgia	113	7		C	30
Hawaii	140	-3	Contract	C	95
Idaho	88	10		C	95

	Total Dollars Awarded*	Change in Personnel Budget since Grantee Qualified for Planning Grant*	States in which Grantee has relied heavily on Contractors to Develop Plan	State Solid Waste Planning Rating	Percent Completion of State Plan
TOTALS					
Illinois					
Indiana	21			C	5
Iowa					
Kansas	55	11		B	90
Kentucky	118	40	Contract	A	100
Louisiana	22	1		C	95
Maine	40	3		C	30
Maryland	106	65		C	5
Massachusetts	25			C	0
Michigan	94	-17	Contract	C	50
Minnesota	102	62	Contract	B	60
Mississippi	59	10		C	30
Missouri	74	0		C	20
Montana	51	13		B	95
Nebraska					
Nevada					

	Total Dollars Awarded*	Change in Personnel Budget since Grantee Qualified for Planning Grant*	States in which Grantee has relied heavily on Contractors to Develop Plan	State Solid Waste Planning Rating	Percent Completion of State Plan
TOTALS					
New Hampshire	12			C	0
New Jersey	472	180	Contract	B	95
New Mexico	78	-24		B	30
New York	1063	154	Contract	A	100
North Carolina	45	3		C	5
North Dakota	45	6		B	65
Ohio	191	26	Contract	C	40
Oklahoma	95	13		B	95
Oregon	62	34		B	100
Pennsylvania	745	333		A	90
Rhode Island	24	1		B	85
South Carolina	96	17	Contract	C	30
South Dakota	31	3		C	0
Tennessee	107	31		B	95
Texas	61	-4		C	50

	Total Dollars Awarded*	Change in Personnel Budget since Grantee Qualified for Planning Grant*	States in which Grantee has relied heavily on Contractors to Develop Plan	State Solid Waste Planning Rating	Percent Completion of State Plan
TOTALS					
Utah	24	+4		C	0
Vermont	24			C	0
Virginia	105	-2		C	25
Washington	82	13		A	80
West Virginia	85	19		C	80
Wisconsin					
Wyoming	14			C	0
Guam					
Puerto Rico					
Virgin Islands					

---

*in thousands of dollars

**see Exhibits V and VI

APPENDIX A

July 1, 1970

This document is an analysis and summary of each solid waste planning grantee. The following information is included for each grantee.

*The population represented by each grantee.

*Critical events that have occurred through 3/1/70.

*Critical events forecast through 7/1/71.

*A general description of the project.

*A summary of the financial history of each grant.

*A summary of the initial and current planning staff for each grantee.

Critical Event Summaries of Solid Waste Planning Grantees

Arkansas

A. Population represented: 1,969,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Solid waste at same level as air and water in an environmental agency.
2. Open-burning prohibition.
3. Statewide survey complete.
4. Plan development in process.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Statewide plan to be completed.

D. Project Description:

Solid waste activities are carried out in the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission which also has counterpart sections for air and water. This organizational relationship provides an atmosphere of cooperation which contributes to overall environmental quality. For example, the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission has passed an air pollution code which prohibits open burning of refuse within an S.M.S.A., within 10 miles of cities having a population of 25,000 or greater, or within 5 miles of a city with a population of 5,000 or greater.

Having completed the state-wide survey of solid waste management and prepared a preliminary outline of the plan document, the state of Arkansas is five percent complete with their state solid waste management plan. At this time, the preliminary outline is in review by the Bureau, and as a result of the review comments, the outline will be reworked into a form acceptable to both the state and the Bureau. The state will then be set on a schedule for completion of the plan, with a target date of September 30, 1970.

---

*Estimated figures from Bureau of the Census 7/1/67

ARKANSAS

TOTAL AWARDED: $39,536 *

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00032

GRANTEE : Arkansas Pollution Control Commission
Little Rock, Arkansas

WITHDRAWN: .94 cents

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
10/1/67 - 9/30/68 - 01				
PHS	FY-68 -	$20,200*	$11,341.06	$ .94
Grantee		20,200	11,517.06	
		$40,400	$22,858.12	
10/1/68 - 9/30/69 - 02				
PHS	FY-69 -	$12,058*		
		8,142 Carry-over		
		$20,200 Total PHS available	$11,750	$ -0-
Grantee		20,200	12,096	
		$40,400	$23,846	
10/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-70 -	$ 7,278*		
		9,166 Carry-over		
		$16,444 Total PHS Available		
Grantee		16,444		
		$32,888		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	3
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	Extra Help	Extra Help
------		-----	-----
Personnel Budget		$27,200	$24,888

California

A. Population represented: 19,163,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Well qualified staff.
2. Survey complete.
3. Volumes I and II of Statewide plan complete.
4. Use of State Advisory Committee.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/70:

1. Add needed staff
2. Implement plan.
3. Possible reorganization of environmental agencies.
4. Further studies in certain problem areas.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey has been completed with the results published in Volume I of the State plan "Status of Solid Waste Management in California." Additional data was collected and analyzed concerning role of governmental jurisdictions, and industry and agriculture in solid waste management.

Considerable public relations and information activities have been conducted throughout the program. Included has been the use of a Statewide Technical Advisory Committee to recommend policy and review progress in the implementation of the planning project.

The second volume of the State plan which contains recommendations has been completed and is in review. Further State plan work will be involved with studies designed to solve specific problem areas, data updating, legislation, and public information activities.

CALIFORNIA

GRANT NO.:	G05-EC-00008	TOTAL AWARDED:	$ 296,843*
GRANTEE :	State Department of Public Health Berkeley, California	WITHDRAWN:	$ 10,268.12

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
PHS	FY-66	$ 50,000*		$ 37,435.12	$ .88
Grantee		67,799		51,169.00	
		$117,799		$ 88,604.12	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02					
PHS	FY-67	$ 70,000*			
		11,000	Carry-over		
		$ 81,000	Total PHS	$ 73,828.41	$ .59
Grantee		89,500		73,989.49	
		$170,500		$147,817.90	
6/1/68 - 5/31/69 - 03					
PHS	FY-68	$68,385*			
		8,735	Carry-over		
		$77,120	Total PHS	$ 66,853.35	$10,266.65
Grantee		78,500		71,253.00	
		$155,620		$138,106.35	
6/1/69 - 8/31/70 - 04 (Renewal)					
PHS	FY-69	$69,913*			
Grantee		70,270			
		$140,183			
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 05 (Renewal)					
PHS	FY-70	$ 38,545*	(Partial funding- $29,658 on '71 backlog)		
Grantee		38,545			
		$77,090			

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	3	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		2
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget	$39,700	$114,027

Colorado

A. Population represented: 1,975,000

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey completed.
2. Legislation and regulations drafted.
3. State plan nearly complete.
4. Close involvement with the Denver Regional Council of Governments.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Increased public relations.
2. Conduct agricultural and industrial surveys.
3. Examine the abandoned automobile problem.

D. Project Description:

Having completed its Statewide survey of solid waste practices, development of legislation and regulations, and nearing completion of the State solid waste management plan, Colorado is in the final stages of its initial planning program.

Currently, the plan is 95 percent complete, with only final review and comment necessary before the final draft is completed and the plan is published for distribution. Additional planning activities anticipated for the State are an increased public relations program, a close involvement with solid waste planning through the Denver Regional Council of Governments, an agricultural and industrial survey, and increased attention to the abandoned automobile problem.

COLORADO

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00001 TOTAL AWARDED: $90,196*

GRANTEE : Colorado State Dept. of Public Health WITHDRAWN: $984.21
Denver, Colorado

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-66	$21,265*	$14,879.94	$ .06
Grantee		21,265	19,379.53	
		$42,530	$34,259.47	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02				
PHS	FY-67	$22,250*	$20,750.85	$984.15
Grantee		22,250	28,101.82	
		$44,500	$48,852.67	
6/1/68 - 8/31/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-68	$22,431*		
		6,900 Carry-over		
	FY-70 (S)	24,250*		
		$53,581 Total PHS Available		
Grantee		58,799		
		$112,380		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	5	3
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget		$32,529	$45,650

Connecticut

A. Population represented: 2,925,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey completed.
2. Special incinerator survey conducted.
3. State plan is being developed.
4. Legislation has been passed which is air pollution oriented.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. State plan will be completed.
2. Public relations.
3. Examination of specific problem points as defined by the State plan.

D. Project Description:

The survey is finished and much of the data is being updated during quarterly site inspection. A special questionnaire collected more detailed information about incinerators. Twelve million dollars has been authorized for the construction of sanitary landfills and incinerators. Two important activities are operator training and public relations. A Study of Refuse Disposal Methods in Connecticut was done in 1968. The State plan will be completed with the help of a consultant by June 1970.

CONNECTICUT

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00023

GRANTEE : Connecticut State Dept. of Health
Hartford, Conn.

TOTAL AWARDED: $217,066*

WITHDRAWN: 11,558.38

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY- 66	$ 25,402*	$ 21,267.76	$4,134.24
Grantee		25,402	22,273.87	
		$ 50,804	$43,541.63	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-67	$ 41,013*		
	FY-68	6,049* (02S1)		
		$ 47,062 Total PHS	$39,637.86	$7,424.14
Grantee		47,133	45,302.88	
		$ 94,195	$84,940.74	
6/1/68 - 6/30/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-68	$ 62,119*		
	FY-69	35,484* (03S1)		
	FY-70	46,999* (03S2)		
		$144,602 Total PHS		
Grantee		144,602		
		$289,204		

7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 04 (Renewal)
BACKLOG- FY-71 $81,544

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	4	5
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		4
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	5	5
	less than 50% - - - -		2
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	3
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	1
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$37,880	$120,637 6/1/69 - 5/31/70

Delaware

A. Population represented: 523,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. Statewide survey completed.

   2. Statewide framework was developed to guide regional planning.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Legislation to permit regional planning.

   2. Development of regional plans for the State's three counties.

D. Project Description:

Survey data and other pertinent planning information were compiled in a Solid Waste Framework Study. Although it represents only 5 percent of the total State Plan effort, this study will guide the solid waste planning for each of the State's three counties. Before county planning begins, however, the intent of proposed State legislation to finance these plans must be clarified. When the county plans are finished, the Board of Health will prepare a plan for administering its solid waste responsibilities.

DELAWARE

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00037

GRANTEE : Delaware State Board of Health
Dover, Delaware

TOTAL AWARDED: $44,718*

WITHDRAWN: .50 cents

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/67 - 12/31/68 - 01				
PHS	FY-67	$10,000*	$ 9,255.50	$ .50
Grantee		11,810	13,141.19	
		$21,810	$22,396.69	
1/1/69 - 6/30/70 - 02				
PHS	FY-69	$28,718*		
		744 Carry-over		
	FY-70	6,000*		
		$35,462 Total PHS		
Grantee		35,463		
		$70,925		
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 03				
PHS	FY-70	$ -0-*		
		10,695 Carry-over		
		$10,695 Total PHS		
Grantee		16,376		
		$27,071		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1 Health Educator trainee 10%
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	2 (not a full yr.)	
Personnel Budget		$15,700	$21,670

District of Columbia

A. Population represented: 811,400**

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. A solid waste management plan has been developed for the District. The plan considers all operating considerations including collection and disposal.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Plan inplementation by both the District Health Department and Sanitary Engineering Department.

D. Project Description:

Solid waste planning activities are shared by two departments. The Health Department handles legislations, on-site collection and disposal, private incineration, and hospital wastes. The Sanitary Engineering Department is responsible for other special wastes, collection, public incinerators and disposal sites. A solid waste management plan for the District of Columbia is complete except for final editing.

DIST. OF COLUMBIA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00030 TOTAL AWARDED: $137,400 *

GRANTEE : Department of Sanitary Engineering WITHDRAWN: NONE
District of Columbia Government
Washington, D.C.

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
2/1/68 - 1/31/69 - 01				
PHS	FY-68	$50,000*	$50,000	None
Grantee		68,712	58,046	
		$118,812	$108,046	
2/1/69 - 7/31/70 - 02 (R)				
PHS	FY-69	$ 81,900*		
	FY-70	5,500* (02S1)		
		$ 87,400 Total PHS		
Grantee		87,412		
		$174,812		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	3	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	11	11
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	7
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		3
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -	1	1
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
			7 Summer Trainees YOC

Personnel Budget		$99,787	$145,636

Florida

A. Population represented: 5,996,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey has been completed.
2. Analysis of data is now underway with the plan development to follow.
3. Extensive public relations are conducted.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The State plan will be completed.
2. Special study areas identified by the Plan will be investigated.

D. Project Description:

A reorganization of State departments has temporarily hampered solid waste planning progress and coordination among departments. Nevertheless, the survey has been completed and the data is now being analyzed. Public information activities include a bulletin about the agency's work, presentations to civic groups and special articles for journals. The State plan is 20 percent finished and will be done by October 1970.

FLORIDA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00025

TOTAL AWARDED: $64,581*

GRANTEE : Florida State Board of Health
Jacksonville, Florida

WITHDRAWN: .99 cents

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$26,418*	$13,837.01	$ .99
	Grantee		26,418	18,009.00	
			$52,836	$31,846.01	
9/1/68 - 9/30/69 - 02					
	PHS	FY-69	$12,981*		
			12,024 Carry-over		
			$25,005 Total PHS Available		
	Grantee		25,005		
			$50,010		
10/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-70	$25,182*		
			556 Carry-over		
			$25,738 Total PHS available		
	Grantee		$25,738		
			$51,476		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	3	3
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	3 (No chg. to grant)	3 (No chg. to grant)
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$30,600	$41,416

Georgia

A. Population represented: 4,511,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey of all communities with more than 5,000 people.
2. State plan is being developed.
3. Staff has been expanded.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Survey of communities under 5,000 population.
2. The status report of solid waste conditions and plan will be finished.

D. Project Description:

A survey of all communities with more than 5,000 people has been completed; smaller communities will be surveyed next year. Future inventories will collect data about wastes from hospitals, mental health facilities, parks, food-service establishments, industrial and agricultural operations. A few regional and metropolitan studies are starting a trend for local solid waste planning throughout the State. A status report of state-wide solid waste practices will be available in early 1970. The remainder of the State plan, now 25 percent complete, will be finished by March 1971.

GEORGIA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00022

TOTAL AWARDED: $118,985*

GRANTEE : Georgia Dept. of Public Health
Atlanta, Georgia

WITHDRAWN: $5,657.18

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01					
PHS	FY-67 -	$30,284*		$17,996.89	$481.11
Grantee		30,284		23,250.48	
		$60,568		$41,247.37	
9/1/67 - 3/31/69 - 02					
PHS	FY-68	$27,286*			
		11,806	Carry-over		
		$39,092	Total PHS available	$33,915.93	$5,176.07
Grantee		39,103		44,404.42	
		$78,195		$78,320.35	
4/1/69 - 3/31/70 - 03 (Renewal)					
PHS	FY-69	$41,869*			
Grantee		41,908			
		$83,777			
4/1/70 - 3/31/71 - 04					
PHS	FY-70	$19,546*			
		14,761	Carry-over		
		$34,307	Total PHS available		
Grantee		40,936			
		$75,243			

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100%	1	2
	75% - 99%	1	
	50% - 74%		1
	less than 50%	6	1
Technical:	100%		
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 75%		
	less than 50%		
Secretarial:	100%	1	1
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 74%	1	
	less than 50%		1
Personnel Budget		$43,348	$50,005

Guam

A. Population represented: 67,044*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. The Territory-wide survey of solid waste practices has begun.
2. Planning is a responsibility of the Department of Public Works--the same agency responsible for implementation.
3. Close coordination has been developed and is maintained with the U.S. Air Force and Navy.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The plan will be completed and implementation will continue as an operating activity of the Department of Public Works.

D. Project Description:

Guam has recently begun its Territory-wide survey and planning program following a cooperative technical assistance activity with the Bureau of Solid Waste Management.

The Guam planning program is unique in that the planning area is a "closed system" contained within the confines of a single island. In addition, the plan to be developed will be operation-oriented and will be implemented by the Guam Department of Public Works--the same agency which is preparing the plan.

The Department of Public Works has prepared an atmosphere conducive to planning and ultimate implementation by forming an advisory committee of representative citizens including members of the U.S. Air Force and Navy. The armed forces on the island represent about half the total population and a large portion of solid waste generation.

GUAM

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00050 TOTAL AWARDED: $53,775*

GRANTEE : Department of Public Works
Government of Guam
Agöna, Guam

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
11/1/69 - 10/31/70 - 01				
PHS	FY-69	$53,775*	(Amended)	
Grantee		53,775		
		$107,550		

Future support recommended -
02 - $28,275

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	3	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -	2	
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	

Personnel Budget $14,150

Hawaii

A. Population represented: 741,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey is complete.
2. The State plan is being developed in association with the University of Hawaii.
3. A close relationship is maintained among all other agencies--particularly those concerned with environmental quality.
4. A City-County plan for Honolulu is also being developed.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The State and Honolulu plans will be completed.
2. Legislation will be updated and amended.

D. Project Description:

The Hawaii State Department of Health is conducting its solid waste planning program using in-house staff and a service contract with the University of Hawaii.

The survey has been completed and the State plan is 80 percent complete. Installation of system analysis procedures and a management information system will provide a method of optimizing the overall operation and provide continuing data for planning. In addition, the approach to planning for solid waste management in Hawaii is to recognize the geographical separation and the problems of a "closed system" presented by each island-county. The State plan will accordingly prescribe separate detailed solid waste management plans for each county. The counties of Kauai, Maui, Hawaii, and Honolulu have a total of sixteen hard-pressed communities which need immediate solutions. Proposals for the 1970-1979 period are being developed for these communities.

Additional recommendations are to combine solid waste management with air and water pollution control in each county.

HAWAII

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00013

GRANTEE : Hawaii State Dept. of Health
Honolulu, Hawaii

TOTAL AWARDED: $140,482*

WITHDRAWN: $443.44

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 12/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-66	$20,400*	$19,900.56	$443.44
Grantee		22,704	20,395.95	
		$43,104	$40,296.51	
1/1/68 - 12/31/70 - 02				
PHS	FY-68	$40,924*		
		56 Carry-over		
		$40,980		
	FY-69	28,330* (S1)		
	FY-69	828* (S2)		
	FY-70	50,000* (S3)		
		$120,138 Total PHS available		
Grantee		139,203		
		$259,341		

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100%	1	
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 74%	21	6
	less than 50%		
Technical:	100%		
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 75%		
	less than 50%		
Secretarial:	100%	1	
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 74%	1	1
	less than 50%		
Personnel Budget		$39,390	$18,203 - (Personnel budgeted for period 7/1/69 12/31/70)

Idaho

A. Population represented: 699,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey is complete .
2. Plan is being developed.
3. Legislation has been developed.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The State plan will be completed.
2. Model county plans will be developed.
3. Industrial and agricultural surveys will be undertaken.

D. Project Description:

The state of Idaho has completed the preliminary planning activities of a state-wide survey of solid waste management practices and an outline of the plan document. Currently, one chapter of the plan has been completed, and other chapters are in the early writing stages. This represents approximately a 35 percent completion of the plan. A schedule has been arranged for plan completion with a publishing date of June 1, 1970. Additional work in solid waste planning is anticipated in the areas of: interagency planning cooperation, an industrial and agricultural survey, an expanded public relations program, and development of a model county solid waste management plan.

IDAHO

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00015	TOTAL AWARDED: $88,259*
GRANTEE : Idaho Department of Health Boise, Idaho	WITHDRAWN: $971.80

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
PHS	FY-66	$21,610*		$11,318.63	$ .37
Grantee		24,010		14,793.66	
		$45,620		$26,112.29	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02					
PHS	FY-67	$11,702*			
		9,000	Carry-over		
		$20,702	Total PHS available	$14,723.57	$971.43
Grantee		22,268		17,963.19	
		$42,970		$32,686.76	
6/1/68 - 5/31/70 - 03					
PHS	FY-68	$16,285*			
		6,298	Carry-over		
		$22,583			
	FY-69	14,026*	(S1)		
		$36,609	Total PHS Available		
Grantee		36,619			
		$73,228			
6/1/70 -5/31/71 - 04 (Renewal)					
PHS	FY-70	$24,636*			
Grantee		24,645			
		$49,281			

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	27	28
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	
Personnel Budget		$32,824	$43,464

Indiana

A. Population represented: 4,999,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Work under the grant program has just begun.
2. The Statewide survey is complete and was accomplished prior to the grant award.
3. Legislation prohibiting open dumping will become effective on January 1, 1971.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The State plan will be completed.
2. Local and regional model plans will be formulated.

D. Project Description:

Indiana has completed its Statewide survey of solid waste practices and has begun development of phase 1 of its State plan. Through coordination with a governor's task force the State solid waste plan will result in local solid waste plans supervised by the State Division of Planning in the Lieutenant-Governor's office. The State has developed regulations prohibiting open dumping and is conducting public information activities.

INDIANA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00044 TOTAL AWARDED: $21,025*

GRANTEE : Indiana State Board of Health
Indianapolis, Indiana

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
12/1/69 - 11/30/70 - 01				
	PHS	FY-70	$21,025*	
	Grantee		33,056	
			$54,081	

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	4	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	10	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	5	

Personnel Budget $44,856

Kansas

A. Population represented: 2,275,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. The Statewide survey is complete.
2. Legislation has been drafted and is in committee.
3. The State plan is being developed.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The State plan will be finished.
2. Pending solid waste legislation will propably be passed.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey of solid waste practices is finished and the State plan 85 percent complete. The plan is quite comprehensive in its approach. A section of the plan is concerned with organization and management of solid waste systems on a regional basis.

Legislation has been drafted and is in legislative committee and will probably be acted upon during 1970.

Extensive public relations and information activities have been conducted throughout this program. In addition, moves have been taken to form the solid waste program as a section within the Division of Environmental Health Services.

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00035

TOTAL AWARDED: $55,602*

WITHDRAWN: $ .51

GRANTEE : Kansas State Dept. of Health
Topeka, Kansas

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
2/1/68 - 1/31/69 - 01				
PHS	FY-67	$17,877* Amended	$16,555.49	$ .51
Grantee		18,249	19,500.68	
		$36,126	$36,056.17	
2/1/69 - 1/31/70 - 02				
PHS	FY-69	$20,451*	$18,320.94	
Grantee		22,992	19,107.32	
		$43,443	$37,428.16	
2/1/70 - 1/31/71 - 03		$17,274*		
PHS -	FY-70 →	4,104 Carry-over		
		$21,378 Total PHS		
Grantee		21,492		
		$42,870		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	12	4
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget		$27,450	$39,095

Kansas-Missouri Interstate (K. C. Area)

A. Population represented: 1,450,000**

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. A region-wide survey has been completed.

   2. The regional solid waste management plan is being developed.

   3. A technical advisory committee provides guidance to the agency in solid waste management.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. The plan will be completed with steps for implementation to follow.

D. Project Description:

A consultant has finished an intensive survey of the Kansas City Region and will complete a comprehensive solid waste management plan by June 1970. The grantee organized a technical advisory committee which has been instrumental in reviewing the consultant's progress and providing guidance. An accelerated plan for several immediate problems in the area has already resulted in replacing one dump by a sanitary landfill.

KANSAS-MISSOURI INTERSTATE

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00038 TOTAL AWARDED: $155,900*

GRANTEE : Metropolitan Planning Comm.- KCR WITHDRAWN: None
Kansas City, Missouri

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
3/1/68 - 2/28/69 - 01					
	PHS	FY-68	$50,000*	$50,000	none
	Grantee		50,000	50,000	
			$100,000	$100,000	
3/1/69 - 6/30/70 - 02					
	PHS	FY-69	$75,000*		
		FY-70	4,900* (02S1)		
			$79,900 Total PHS		
	Grantee		79,900		
			$159,800		
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 03 (Renewal)					
	PHS	FY-70	$26,000*		
	Grantee		26,000		
			$52,000		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		3
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -	1	
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	
Personnel Budget		$14,800	$39,750

Kentucky

A. Population represented: 3,191,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. The Statewide survey is complete.
2. Legislation in effect establishes construction and operating standards for disposal.
3. The solid waste plan is being developed.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. The State plan will be completed.
2. Additional studies will be conducted in problem areas identified by the State plan.

D. Project Description:

The State survey is complete and has been augmented by a mail-out questionnaire to small communities about their collection and disposal practices. Recently enacted legislation requires a permit for each disposal site and establishes rigorous construction and operation standards. Coordination has prompted other State departments which have solid waste responsibilities to improve their operations. A non-profit consultant, retained by the State for several projects, is assisting the development of the Kentucky solid waste management plan. This work is now 50 percent complete and will be completed by July 1970.

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00005

GRANTEE : Kentucky State Dept. of Health
Frankfort, Ky.

TOTAL AWARDED: $118,725*

WITHDRAWN: $2,306.25

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-66	$15,000*	$ 7,765.80	$ .20
	Grantee		15,000	11,031.01	
			$30,000	$18,796.81	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02					
	PHS	FY-67	$15,000*	$10,840.95	$2,306.05
	Grantee		15,000	14,223.43	
			$30,000	$25,064.38	
6/1/68 - 9/30/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-68	$ 5,913*		
			9,087 Carry-over		
		FY-68	19,750* (03S1)		
		FY-70	30,000* (03S2)		
		FY-70	26,062* (03S3)		
		FY-70	7,000* (03S4)		
			$97,812 Total PHS		
	Grantee		97,812		
			$195,624		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget		$19,959	$50,543

Louisiana

A. Population represented: 3,660,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. The Statewide survey is complete.
2. A State plan has been developed.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Further work might be conducted in the industrial problem areas of solid waste.

D. Project Description:

Having completed the state survey and preliminary draft work, the Louisiana state plan is in the final draft stage with only the incorporation of final review comments necessary before printing. This represents a 95 percent completion of the plan. The plan is exceptionally broad, covering industrial and agricultural wastes and automobile bodies, topics generally reserved for additional planning activities to supplement the basic plan. It is hoped that additional planning activities will be undertaken by the state, especially in conducting a more thorough examination of the industrial and agricultural waste problem in the state.

LOUISIANA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00010

TOTAL AWARDED: $96,837*

GRANTEE : Louisiana State Bd. of Health
New Orleans, La.

WITHDRAWN: $21,928.17

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	
				Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-67	$31,035*	$10,399.39	$4,065.61
Grantee		31,035	11,384.50	
		$62,070	$21,783.89	
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 02				
PHS	FY-68	$29,322*		
		16,570 Carry-over		
		$45,892 Total PHS	$28,029.44	$17,862.56
Grantee		47,661	29,199.15	
		$93,553	$57,228.59	
9/1/68 - 6/30/70 - 03 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-69	$36,480*		
Grantee		37,335		
		$73,815		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100%	5*	2
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 74%		
	less than 50%	12	13
Technical:	100%		
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 75%		
	less than 50%		
Secretarial:	100%	1	3
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 74%		
	less than 50%	1	
Personnel budget		$50,562	$51,490

*One professional at 100% for 6 mos. only)

Maine

A. Population represented: 973,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. Basic Statewide survey complete.

   2. State plan is in process of development.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Proposed solid waste bill is being drafted.

   2. State plan will be completed.

D. Project Description:

Two surveys of statewide solid waste practices preceded the data collection work under this grant. All this information has now been compiled and analyzed. More support for proposed legislation will be fostered through a broader public relations program. Guidelines on solid waste planning will be prepared for State agencies, regional planning commissions and municipalities. The State plan is keying on solutions to six categories of problems. The plan is 5 percent done and the completion date is June 1970.

MAINE

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00024 TOTAL AWARDED: $40,986*

GRANTEE : Maine Dept. of Health and Welfare WITHDRAWN: $559.20
Augusta, Maine

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 12/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-66	$14,000*	$10,426.80	$559.20
Grantee		14,000	10,426.80	
		$28,000	$20,853.60	
1/1/68 - 6/30/69 - 02				
PHS	FY-68	$11,986*		
		3,014 Carry-over		
		$15,000 Total PHS available		
Grantee		15,000		
		$30,000		
7/1/69 - 8/31/70 - 03 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-69	$15,000*		
Grantee		15,000		
		$30,000		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Personnel Budget		$19,216	$22,690

Maryland

A. Population represented: 3,685,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the statewide survey.
2. Extensive public relations work, including informational pamphlets and newsletters.
3. Prepare a ten-year plan for the solid waste responsibilities of the State Health Department.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Expand the ten-year plan into a comprehensive State solid waste management plan.
2. Develop a computer program which selects sanitary landfill sites through the use of systems analysis techniques.

D. Project Description:

The survey is finished and much of the data is updated through site inspections. This program is organized into three sections: technical advice and assistance, planning and program evaluation, and special studies and research. Two popular publications, a pamphlet describing the State's solid waste problems and a monthly newsletter, receive wide distribution. New legislation requires a public hearing prior to the operation of any disposal facility. A "Waste Acceptance Authority" is being considered by the 1970 Legislature. Engineering students are hired for summertime work as part of the agency's career development program. A ten-year plan has already been developed. It will serve as the basis for the State's solid waste management plan, scheduled for publication in October 1970.

MARYLAND

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00009

TOTAL AWARDED: $106,046*

GRANTEE : Maryland State Dept. of Health
Baltimore, Maryland

WITHDRAWN: $ .40

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
1/1/67 - 12/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$29,467*	$ 3,445.60	$ .40
	Grantee		30,318	18,747.61	
			$59,785	$22,193.21	
1/1/68 - 9/30/69 - 02					
	PHS	FY-68	$24,863*		
			26,021 Carry-over		
			$50,884 Total PHS	$35,086	$ -0-
	Grantee		51,260	80,723	
			$102,144	$115,809	
10/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-70	$51,716*		
			15,798 Carry-over		
			$67,514 Total PHS		
	Grantee		91,264		
			$158,778		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100%	3	5 - (one for 6 mos.only)
	75% - 99%	1	3
	50% - 74%		
	less than 50%		
Technical:	100%		
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 75%		
	less than 50%		
Secretarial:	100%	1	1
	75% - 99%	1	2
	50% - 74%		
	less than 50%		
Personnel Budget		$52,164	$116,794 (4 part-time students-25%)

Massachusetts

A. Population represented: 5,421,000**

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Initiated a statewide survey of solid waste practices.
2. Received authorization to approve operational plans for disposal sites.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the survey.
2. Develop the state plan, with the aid of a consultant.

D. Project Description:

This project had to be postponed for nearly three years until State administrative procedures were clarified. Now the solid waste survey has begun and additional delays are not expected. Recent legislation authorized the Department of Public Works to operate disposal sites within the State. These operations must have the Health Department's approval.

MASSACHUSETTS

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00016

TOTAL AWARDED: $25,000*

GRANTEE : Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Dept. of Public Health
Boston, Massachusetts

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
7/1/79 - 10/31/70 - 01			
PHS	FY-67	$25,000* (Amended)	
Grantee		25,000	
		$50,000	

(Additional Support Recommended)
02 - $30,882
03 - $32,094

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	4	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget $34,213

Maryland-Virginia Interstate

A. Population represented: 3,000,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Compile the findings and recommendations of many studies about solid waste management in the six county-District of Columbia area.
2. Establish the Metropolitan Waste Management Agency to operate systems of waste collection and disposal.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Plan and implement a system of rail hauling solid wastes to disposal sites.

D. Project Description:

During the past decade many studies, including some about solid wastes, have been made in the Metropolitan Washington area. The findings of this work endorse a system of rail-hauling solid wastes to disposal sites. A strategy to implement this system is now being planned. The Metropolitan Washington Waste Management Agency, a subsidiary of the grantee, will be the operating agency for the adopted plan.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00046

TOTAL AWARDED: $100,000*

Withdrawn:

GRANTEE : Metropolitan Washington Council
of Governments
Washington D.C.

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
3/1/69 - 6/30/70 - 01			
PHS	FY-69	$40,000*	
Grantee		40,000	
		$80,000	
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 02 (Renewal)			
PHS	FY-70	$60,000*	
Grantee		60,000	
		$120,000	

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	6	5
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
----------------	plus	5% Admin. staff	plus Admin. staff
Personnel Budget		$43,260	$45,137

Michigan

A. Population represented: 8,584,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of statewide survey.
2. Good coordination channels with other State and local agencies which have pollution control responsibilities.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.
2. Increase the solid waste planning staff.

D. Project Description:

Michigan's Statewide survey has been completed as has the analysis of much of the data collected. Public relations activities have been conducted throughout the program. Legislative activities in solid waste problems have been actively pursued since Act 87, Public Acts of 1965. In addition, the County Plan Act authorizes counties to establish and provide solid waste collection and disposal facilities for or between cities, villages, townships, and improvement districts.

Coordination between other State agencies, the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, county planning agencies, and other pollution control agencies has been conducted.

The State plan development has been delayed somewhat due to personnel shortages. Nevertheless, the plan is now about 20 percent complete. It is anticipated that the entire plan will be completed during 1970.

MICHIGAN

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00036

TOTAL AWARDED: $101,911*

GRANTEE : Michigan Dept. of Public Health
Lansing, Michigan

WITHDRAWN: $7,741.48

FISCAL HISTORY:			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$58,035*	$25,263.52	$7,741.48
	Grantee		58,057	28,306.33	
			$116,092	$53,569.85	
6/1/68 - 6/30/70 - 02					
	PHS	FY-68	$43,876*		
			25,030 Carry-over		
			$68,906 Total PHS available		
	Grantee		68,906		
			$137,812		

7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 03 (Renewal)
BACKLOG- FY-71 $82,612

Future support recommended
04 - $82,612

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	69	76
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		1

Personnel Budget		$87,039	$69,872

Minnesota

A. Population represented: 3,582,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Survey of statewide solid waste practices is nearly completed.
2. Broadly-oriented public relations activities, including newsletters and slide program.
3. Enabling legislation with rules and regulations.
4. Constructive staffing activities.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State survey
2. Develop the State plan
3. Planning studies of the auto-hulk and feedlot solid waste problems

D. Project Description:

Solid waste activities in Minnesota are conducted by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency which is also concerned with air and water pollution and pollution related to land use planning. The Statewide survey is 50 percent complete. In addition, considerable planning and coordination has been accomplished in cooperation with the Metropolitan Council which represents 78 percent of the State's population. Enabling legislation, followed with rules and regulations have been adopted to provide proper disposal procedures. These activities were conducted in conjunction with an active public relations and information program.

The State plan is 50 percent complete. The plan will consolidate the eleven regions delineated by the State Planning Agency into four solid waste regions.

Further work in solid waste planning will investigate the auto hulk and feed-lot problems. Following studies into these problems will be recommended solutions for updating the original plan.

MINNESOTA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00034 TOTAL AWARDED: $102,618*

GRANTEE : Minnesota Pollution Control Agency WITHDRAWN: $ 0
Minneapolis, Minn.

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/68 - 6/30/69 - 01						
	PHS	FY-67	$16,303*		$16,303	-0-
	Grantee		16,303		80,821	
			$32,606		$97,124	
7/1/69 - 6/30/70 - 02						
	PHS	FY-69	$40,758*			
		FY-70	10,000*	(02S1)		
		FY-70	12,500*	(02S2)		
			$63,258	Total PHS		
	Grantee		63,259			
			$126,517			
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 03						
	PHS	FY-70	$23,057*	(Partial funding- $34,586 on '71 backlog)		
	Grantee		23,057			
			$46,114			

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	3
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		3
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	4	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		2
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$24,184	$86,586 (incl. $17,838 for Admin. Serv.)

Mississippi

A. Population represented: 2,348,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. The Statewide survey is nearly finished.

   2. Several community solid waste management plans have been prepared.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Complete the survey.

   2. Prepare the first draft of the State solid waste management plan.

D. Project Description:

   Currently, the Statewide survey is underway and nearly complete. Public relations and information activities are also being conducted.

   The state has been active in solid waste management for a number of years and has prepared community solid waste management plans for several local governments in the State. These plans will provide an important guide in development of the State plan following the solid waste survey.

MISSISSIPPI

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00045 TOTAL AWARDED: $59,497*

GRANTEE : Mississippi State Board of Health
Jackson, Mississippi

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
3/1/69 - 2/28/70 - 01			Withdrawn
PHS	FY69	$31,029*	$25,836.40
Grantee		31,029	27,317.30
		$62,058	$53,153.70
3/1/70 - 2/28/71 - 02			
PHS	FY-70	$28,468*	
		4,777 Carry-over	
		$33,245 Total PHS available	
Grantee		33,245	
		$66,490	

Future support recommended -
03 yr. $25,100

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	3	3
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	plus county Sanitarians	plus County Sanitarians
Personnel Budget		$48,264	$57,794

Missouri

A. Population represented: 4,605,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the State survey.
2. Strong cooperation with the statewide regional planning commission.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State plan.

D. Project Description:

The survey is nearly finished and data analysis will follow. Legislation to license and regulate disposal sites was introduced in the last legislature but final action was postponed until the next legislative session. Special efforts are made to interest the State's 20 regional planning commissions in solid waste planning.

MISSOURI

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00039

TOTAL AWARDED: $74,398 *

GRANTEE : Missouri Division of Health
Jefferson City, Missouri

WITHDRAWN: .30 cents
(Restricted to 03 - $5,568)

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
8/1/68 - 7/31/69 - 01				
PHS	FY-68	$36,831* (Amended)	$31,262.70	$ .30
Grantee		36,831	36,254.55	
		$73,662	$67,517.25	
8/1/69 - 7/31/70 - 02				
PHS	FY-70	$37,567*		
Grantee		37,567		
		$75,134		

Future support recommended -
03 yr. $39,433

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	4	3
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		1

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$59,231	$59,231
Note: Staff above also includes for both initial & current year - County & District Personnel @5% - Number & position not listed	$19,800	$22,667

↑ These figures are included in personnel figure shown above

Montana

A. Population represented: 701,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. Completion of statewide survey.

   2. First draft of the State solid waste management plan.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Complete the State plan.

   2. Develop a model regional plan for solid waste management.

   3. Initiate an industrial and agricultural survey.

D. Project Description:

Progress in Montana has reached the writing stage with approximately 45 percent of the plan complete. The state survey has been completed and drafts of three individual plan chapters have been submitted and reviewed. It is anticipated that the entire plan will be reviewed as a whole once all the individual chapters have been completed. The state is working on a completion schedule which is aimed at a June 1, 1970 publication date for the plan. Further planning activities include: developing a model regional plan and a model county plan, conducting an industrial and agricultural survey, and giving additional attention to the abandoned automobile problem.

MONTANA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00028

TOTAL AWARDED: $ $53,992*

GRANTEE : Montana State Bd. of Health
Helena, Montana

WITHDRAWN: $ 2,782

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROF	
					Withdrawn
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 01					
PHS	FY-67	$20,434*		$17,532	$ -0-
Grantee		22,232		17,914	
		$42,666		$35,446	
6/1/68 - 5/31/69 - 02					
PHS	FY-68	$14,087*			
		2,902	Carry-over		
		$16,989	Total PHS	$12,557	$2,782.00
Grantee		19,831		13,911	
		$36,820		$26,468	
6/1/69 - 8/31/70 - 03					
PHS	FY69	$19,471*			
		1,650	Carry-over		
		$21,121	Total PHS		
Grantee		22,120			
		$43,241			

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	33	5
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget		$32,564	$46,178

Nebraska-Iowa Interstate (Omaha area)

A. Population represented: 546,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Prepare and publish the Omaha-Council Bluffs Solid Waste Disposal Plan.

2. Public educational program to inform the citizens about the plan for solid waste disposal.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Public hearings to have the plan accepted by local jurisdictions within the interstate planning area.

D. Project Description:

A consultant conducted an intensive survey of the Omaha-Council Bluffs metropolitan area and completed a solid waste disposal plan in July 1969. Now a committee of local officials is reviewing the plan and making suggestions for its implementation. A program has been launched to inform the public about the plan's recommendations for waste disposal.

OMAHA-COUNCIL BLUFFS
METRO. AREA PLANNING AGENCY

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00041 TOTAL AWARDED: $ 75,155*

GRANTEE : Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan WITHDRAWN:
Area Planning Agency
Omaha, Nebraska

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
7/1/68 - 12/31/70 - 01			Withdrawn
PHS	FY-68	$60,405* (Amended)	
	FY-69	14,750* (01S1)	
		$75,155 Total PHS	
Grantee		75,155	
		$150,310	

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		2
	less than 50% - - - -	3	2
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
Personnel Budget		$12,300	$18,790

New Hampshire

A. Population represented: 685,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. A three-year solid waste planning grant project was recently approved by the Public Health Service.
2. An Interim Study Committee of the State Legislature was formed in order to review status of solid waste management in New Hampshire.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Employ a solid waste planning staff.
2. Initiate the statewide survey of solid waste practices.

D. Project Description:

This agency applied for a Solid Waste Planning Grant, and the application is now being reviewed by the State's Clearinghouse, as required by Bureau of the Budget circular A-95. The project is expected to begin shortly.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00051

TOTAL AWARDED: $12,725*

GRANTEE : Div. of Public Health Services
Dept. of Health & Welfare
Concord, New Hampshire

WITHDRAWN:

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
6/1/70 - 5/31/71 - 01			
PHS	FY-70	$12,725*	
Grantee		12,725	
		$25,450	

Future support recommended -
02 - $13,000
03 - $14,500

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	8	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Personnel Budget $20,965

New Jersey

A. Population represented: 7,004,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey complete.

2. State solid waste plan draft complete including data base, built-in management techniques, such as map plotting, regression analysis and allocation model. Plan is on tape and is automated, but is supplemented by a plan report.

3. Extensive legislation with accompanying rules and regulations.

4. Inspections are conducted for enforcement and to provide planning data.

5. Interdisciplinary staff has been formed.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Special studies of problem areas including reclamation and recycling.

2. Development of more definitive reporting of solid waste conditions for management information system (MIS) input.

3. Staff training course development.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey is complete including spot field verification of some of the data. In addition, representative local comprehensive plans with solid waste data and plan elements have been collected and evaluated. Extensive public relations activities have been conducted during the project period as well. Solid waste program legislative efforts have resulted in two new acts and introduction of four additional bills now before the legislature.

Current efforts are being placed upon development of the State plan for solid waste management which is about 40 percent complete. A systems approach is being taken in planning for New Jersey. In addition, a continual planning process system is being installed and will include a management information system to provide continual current and historic data. Once the basic planning process has been formulated, implementation guidelines will be prepared.

NEW JERSEY

TOTAL AWARDED: $ 477,654*

WITHDRAWN: $ 5,485.20

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00007

GRANTEE : Department of Environmental
Protection
Trenton, New Jersey

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-66	$50,000*	$ 25,485.43	$ 514.57
Grantee		61,625	43,729.78	
		$111,625	$ 69,215.21	
6/1/6 - 5/31/68 - 02				
PHS	FY-67	$ 46,000*		
		24,000 Carry-over		
		$ 70,000 Total PHS	$ 65,029.37	$4,970.63
Grantee		78,884	73,956.57	
		$148,884	$138,985.94	
6/1/68 - 6/30/70 - 03 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-68	$ 33,927*		
	FY-69	22,618*(03S1)		
	FY-69	35,000*(03S2)		
	FY-69	45,662*(03S3)		
	FY-70	148,012*(03S4)		
		$285,219 Total PHS		
Grantee		285,236		
		$570,455		
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 04 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-70	$ 96,435*		
Grantee		193,675		
		$290,110		

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	4	7
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		5
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		(2 Student Asst. 3 mos.)
Personnel Budget		$42,076	$222,673

New Mexico

A. Population represented: 1,003,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. Conduct a project for weighing solid wastes in four communities.
3. Recommend standards and regulations for solid waste management, including an open burning prohibition.
4. Organize a State technical advisory committee.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.

D. Project Description:

New Mexico has completed its Statewide survey using Bureau of Solid Waste Management forms. In addition, a detailed one-year weighing program in four communities has been completed in order to develop representative per capita weights for planning.

The State program has recommended solid waste disposal standards and has been instrumental in having regulations adopted prohibiting disposal of solid waste in any water course. Furthermore, municipalities of 5,000 or more population are prohibited from opern burning.

Extensive public relations activities have been conducted in association with the planning project. An advisory committee has also been formed with broad representation from Federal, State, and local and private organizations.

The State plan is 40 percent complete with proposals to the year 2000 and coordinated closely with air and water quality and local comprehensive planning conducted by the State Planning Agency.

NEW MEXICO

GRANT NO.:	G05-EC-00019	TOTAL AWARDED:	$78,161*
GRANTEE :	Health & Social Serv. Dept. Santa Fe, New Mexico	WITHDRAWN:	-0-

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
10/1/67 - 9/30/68 - 01					
	PHS	FY-68	$28,860*	$19,815	$ -0-
	Grantee		30,234	19,815	
			$59,094	$39,630	
10/1/68 - 9/30/70 - 02					
	PHS	FY-69	$27,184*		
		FY-70	22,117*		
			9,045 Carry-over		
			$58,346 Total PHS		
	Grantee		58,347		
			$116,693		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	49	Various Sanitarians
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	2	
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	
Personnel Budget		$47,414	$23,070** 10/1/69 - 9/30/70**

New York

A. Population represented: 18,335,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey is complete.
2. The State plan including several regional plans have been completed.
3. A substantial State budget has been developed.
4. Interdisciplinary staff has been formed.
5. Efforts have been made to develop comprehensive legislation.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Studies of special problem areas of reclamation and recycling.
2. Develop an automated data and management system for planning.
3. Staff training course development.

D. Project Description:

The State has completed its Statewide survey of solid waste practices. Additional data is being developed through several regional studies. Considerable interagency coordination and public information activities have been conducted as well.

New York is operating under Part 19 of the State Sanitary Code which requires that land disposal operations be conducted as sanitary landfills.

The State plan is approximately 85 percent complete and is being developed in two phases. Phase I, sketch plan is complete and Phase II is underway. Phase II is being approached through system analysis and development of models. Mathematical models are being developed which can be applied to solid waste management throughout the State. The State is studying the solid waste problem on a regional basis. Six separate regional studies have been underway during the past two years, covering nine counties and New York City. Plan reports which result from this Statewide planning activity are designed to enhance implementation of study recommendations.

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00021

TOTAL AWARDED: $1,063,007*

GRANTEE : New York State Dept. of Health
Albany, New York

WITHDRAWN: $ 79.71

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-66	$ 50,000*	$ 49,920.58	$ 79.42
	Grantee		99,268	177,571.40	
			$149,268	$227,492.28	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02 (Renewal)					
	PHS	FY-67	$125,000*	$114,898.71	$ .29
	Grantee		397,127	407,652.46	
			$522,127	$522,551.17	
6/1/68 - 10/31/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-68	$250,000*		
			10,101 Carry-over		
		FY-69	250,000* (03S1)		
		FY-69	250,000* (03S2)		
		FY-70	138,007* (03S3)		
			$898,108 Total PHS		
	Grantee		988,007		
			$1,886,115		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	5	8
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -	1	1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	4	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -	1	
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$104,333	$258,014

North Carolina

A. Population represented: 5,027,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.

2. Prepare plans for the collection and disposal of solid wastes in counties.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.

2. Initiate a study on industrial solid wastes.

D. Project Description:

The state-wide survey is finished and has been supplemented by data on population densities, soil characteristics, watershed protection and ground water supplies. Plans are being prepared for collection and disposal operations in several counties. Industrial solid wastes are a major problem throughout the State and future studies are planned. The State plan will be complete by September 1970.

NORTH CAROLINA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00006 TOTAL AWARDED: $45,511*

GRANTEE : North Carolina State Board of Health WITHDRAWN: $82.07
Raleigh, North Carolina

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01						
	PHS	FY-67	$14,376*		$4,929.60	$ .40
	Grantee		15,303		5,051.35	
			$29,679		$9,980.95	
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 02						
	PHS	FY-68	$ 5,174*			
			9,214	Carry-over		
			$14,388	Total PHS available	$11,472.33	$ 81.67
	Grantee		17,264		14,230.03	
			$31,652		$25,702.36	
9/1/68 - 8/31/70 - 03						
	PHS	FY-69	$11,499*			
			3,066	Carry-over		
			$14,565			
		FY-70	14,462*	(03S1)		
			$29,027	Total PHS available		
	Grantee		39,146			
			$68,173			

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -	2	1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		2
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Personnel Budget		$22,052	$25,608

Note: Staff and personnel budget shown are those on 03S1 for the period 9/1/69 - 8/31/70 - not for full 03 yr. which is 24 mos.

North Dakota

A. Population represented: 639,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. Completion of the Statewide survey.

   2. Draft comprehensive State legislation for solid waste management.

   3. Conduct an intensive public information program through speeches and the distribution of pamphlets.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey has been completed and much of the data analyzed. Legislation has been drafted, but will not be submitted until the 1971 session. In the meantime an extensive public relations and information program is being conducted. A promotion called "Starve a Rat Today" has resulted in distribution of over 18,000 copies of this one-page story.

Work is now beginning on a State plan which will have a strong local orientation.

NORTH DAKOTA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00029 TOTAL AWARDED: $45,827*

GRANTEE : North Dakota State Dept. of Health
Bismarck, North Dakota
WITHDRAWN: $21.38

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
7/1/67 - 6/30/68 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$13,016* (Amended)	$11,523.63	$ .37
	Grantee		13,016	13,780.93	
			$26,032	$25,304.56	
7/1/68 - 6/30/69 - 02					
	PHS	FY-68	$13,496*		
			1,492 Carry-over		
		FY-69	2,832* (02S1)		
			$17,820 Total PHS available	$12,081.99	$ 21.01
	Grantee		18,000	12,152.36	
			$35,820	$24,234.35	
7/1/69 - 12/31/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-69	$16,483*		
			5,717 Carry-over		
			$22,200 Total PHS available		
	Grantee		22,200		
			$44,400		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		1
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -	1	8
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
Personnel Budget		$20,278	$26,904

Ohio

A. Population represented: 10,652,017*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. Passage of a comprehensive solid waste management law with the subsequent adoption of regulations to control all solid waste disposal sites within the State.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.
2. Initiate a study on industrial solid wastes.
3. Publish design and operating guidelines for sanitary landfills in the State of Ohio.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey is finished. Additional data has been gathered on geologic and soil characteristics, water basins, groundwater supplies land use, and population characteristics. Industrial solid wastes are a major problem; future studies are planned to determine the depth of the problem. The State solid waste management plan will probably be completed by July 1971.

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00011

TOTAL AWARDED: $200,930*

GRANTEE : Ohio Department of Health
Columbus, Ohio

WITHDRAWN: 9,768.02

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$34,340*		
		FY-68	4,000* (01S1)		
			$38,340 Total PHS	$36,425.36	$1,674.64
	Grantee		50,670	44,148,18	
			$89,010	$80,573.54	
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 02					
	PHS	FY-68	$45,760*		
			240 Carry-over		
			$46,000 Total PHS	$37,906.62	$8,093.38
	Grantee		67,442	47,789.30	
9/1/68 - 11/30/70 - 03 (Renewal)			$113,442	$85,695.92	
	PHS	FY-69	$ 59,165*		
		FY-70	57,665* (03S1)		
			$116,830 Total PHS		
	Grantee		120,005		
			$236,835		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	5	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -	15	4
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	1
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$71,280	$97,140

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Interstate (Cincinnati)

A. Population represented: 1,600,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Initiate an inventory of data on solid waste management within the nine-county interstate region.

2. Form an interstate technical advisory committee.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Develop the interstate solid waste management plan, with the aid of a consultant.

D. Project Description:

The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Planning Authority is a regional agency representing nine counties in three States and centered in Cincinnati, Ohio.

O-K-I is presently in its inventory phase I in which data will be collected and analyzed on a detailed basis. An EDP program will be developed to handle information for planning and design. In addition, an advisory committee has been formed to provide interfaces with government agencies and private organizations. Further coordination has been developed and is maintained with the respective State solid waste agencies representing the States of which O-K-I is a part.

Phase II will be concerned with actual regional plan formulation.

OHIO-KENTUCKY-INDIANA
INTERSTATE

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00049

TOTAL AWARDED: $88,900*

GRANTEE : Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional
Planning Authority
Cincinnati, Ohio

WITHDRAWN:

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
7/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 01			
PHS	FY-69	$88,900*	
Grantee		88,900	
		$177,800	

Future support recommended -
02 - $64,667

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	2	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget $25,250

Oklahoma

A. Population represented: 2,496,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. Prepare a major portion of the State solid waste management plan.
3. Launch an extensive public relations program.
4. Draft legislation.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State plan.
2. Secure passage of proposed State legislation on solid waste management.

D. Project Description:

Oklahoma has completed its Statewide survey and 80 percent of its State plan for solid waste management.

The State has conducted extensive and effective public relations during the course of this project. Much of these efforts have been designed to support legislation. Legislative activities are presently underway which will provide the State solid waste agency major control of solid waste problems in the State. A bill has been introduced and has passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

OKLAHOMA

GRANT NO.:	G05-EC-00018	TOTAL AWARDED:	$97,444*
GRANTEE :	Oklahoma State Dept. of Health Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	WITHDRAWN:	$ 2,837.06

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-66	$29,500*	$ 9,250.87	$ .13
Grantee		29,500	22,050.91	
		$59,000	$31,301.78	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02				
PHS	FY-67	$12,500*		
		17,000 Carry-over		
		$29,500 Total PHS	$26,663.07	$2,836.93
Grantee		29,500	26,729.30	
		$59,000	$53,392.37	
6/1/68 - 6/30/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-68	$31,712*		
		3,249 Carry-over		
	FY-69	23,732* (03S1)		
		$58,693 Total PHS		
Grantee		58,693		
		$117,386		

COMPLETED

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		7
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget	$25,500	$38,924** 7/1/69-6/30/70**

Oregon

A. Population represented: 1,999,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey and the State solid waste management plan.
2. Completion of a special study on commercial and residential waste.
3. Establishment of a Department of Environmental Quality.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Conduct a special survey on industrial and agricultural wastes.
2. Develop a regional model plan.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey and State plan are both complete. In addition, a separate study on commercial-residential waste has been completed and preparations have been made to begin a survey of industrial-agricultural waste.

Considerable public relations and information efforts have been made.

A new Department of Environmental Quality was established in 1969 and is responsible for State rules and regulations on solid waste, air, and water pollution.

OREGON

TOTAL AWARDED: $62,687*

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00014

WITHDRAWN: $ 633.36

GRANTEE : Oregon State Bd. of Health
Portland, Oregon

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01				$ 7,382.55	None
PHS	FY-67	$12,040*		11,041.72	
Grantee		12,041		$18,424.27	
		$24,081			
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 02				$19,322.09	$633.36
PHS	FY-68	$15,298*		22,062.02	
	(reduced)	4,657	Carry-over	$41,834.11	
		$19,955	Total PHS		
Grantee		25,180			
		$45,135			
9/1/68 -10/31/70 - 03					
PHS	FY-69	$21,157*			
	FY-70	14,192*	(03S1)		
		$35,349	Total PHS		
Grantee		74,715			
		$110,064			

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -	1	
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	2	
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		1
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget		$18,924	$52,151

Pennsylvania

A. Population represented: 11,626,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Statewide survey completed.
2. Agricultural study conducted and included in State plan draft.
3. Preliminary draft of State plan completed including local and regional guidelines.
4. Extensive public relations.
5. Interdisciplinary staff formed.
6. State budget increasing.
7. Legislation developed. Rules and regulations for local and regional planning, disposal site licensing and local grants-in-aid are carried out.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Conduct special studies in industrial wastes and reclamation and recycling.
2. Automate data base and planning management system.
3. Staff training course development.

D. Project Description:

The State has completed its Statewide survey which included 100 percent of the total 2559 political subdivisions. In addition, an industrial-agricultural survey was conducted.

Significant legislation, the Pennsylvania Solid Waste Management Act (Act 241), was signed into law by the governor on July 31, 1968. The Act is broad in its management and planning scope. A unique feature requires municipalities to submit solid waste management plans to the State for approval. Reimbursement of up to 50 percent is available to municipalities for the cost of preparing these plans. Extensive public relations and information activities have continued throughout the project. Current activities include preparation of the State plan document which is 80 percent complete.

PENNSYLVANIA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00020

TOTAL AWARDED: $758,231*

WITHDRAWN: $ 13,608.06

GRANTEE: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Health
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-66	$ 40,374*	$ 33,642.40	$6,731.60
Grantee		70,952	68,011.00	
		$111,326	$101,653.40	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-67	$125,000*	$111,495.54	$6,876.46
Grantee		130,056	128,482.15	
		$255,056	$239,977.69	
6/1/68 - 6/30/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-68	$193,380*		
		6,628 Carry-over		
	FY-69	11,072* (03S1)		
	FY-69	163,331* (03S2)		
		$374,411 Total PHS		
Grantee		378,610		
		$753,021		
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 04 (Renewal)				
PHS	FY-70	$225,074*		
Grantee		332,267		
		$557,341		

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100%	4	14
	75% - 99%		1
	50% - 74%	1	1
	less than 50%	141	166
Technical:	100%		1
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 75%		2
	less than 50%		
Secretarial:	100%	1	1
	75% - 99%		
	50% - 74%		
	less than 50%		3
Personnel Budget		$89,956	$422,946

Puerto Rico

A. Population represented: 2,584,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the island-wide survey of solid waste practices.
2. Completion of solid waste plans for three communities.
3. Completion of Phase I of the Puerto Rico solid waste management plan.
4. Active involvement with the Governor's Task Force on Pollution.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete Phase II of the plan and begin implementation.

D. Project Description:

An island-wide survey is finished and special studies in three communities provided additional data.

Solid waste personnel were active on the Governor's Task Force on Pollution.

Phase I of the Island's solid waste management plan is completed. Alternatives for Phase II are now being considered by a technical advisory committee. The plan will be done by January 1971.

PUERTO RICO

TOTAL AWARDED: $ 56,408*

WITHDRAWN: $ .50

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00027

GRANTEE : Dept. of Health
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
Santurce, P.R.

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 01				
PHS	FY-68	$ 8,330*	$ 3,050.50	$ .50
	FY-68	15,362* (01S1)	12,940.96	
		$23,692 Total PHS	$15,991.46	
Grantee		23,692		
		$47,384		
9/1/68 - 11/30/69 - 02				
PHS	FY-69	$20,171*		
		13,150 Carry-over		
		$33,321 Total PHS	$20,203	$ -0-
Grantee		33,321	49,052	
		$66,642	$69,255	
12/1/69 - 11/30/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-70	$12,545*		
		20,609 Carry-over		
		$33,154 Total PHS		
Grantee		33,155		
		$66,309		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	6
	less than 50% - - - -		2
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -	5	
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -	1	1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
--------------- Personnel Budget		$12,260	$34,709

Rhode Island

A. Population represented: 901,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey .
2. Preparation of the final draft of the State solid waste management plan .
3. Establish a State grant-in-aid program for constructing volume reduction and disposal facilities .

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete and publish the State plan .

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey has been completed and the solid waste management plan is 80 percent complete. The Plan will be finished during 1970.

Legislation for a local grant-in-aid program which assists communities in establishing volume reduction and disposal facilities was passed during this program. The State solid waste agency administers this program. Grant funds are only awarded if the community's long-range disposal plan is approved by the Department of Health. An incentive is offered for regional operations by increasing the State's share of the grant.

RHODE ISLAND

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00012

TOTAL AWARDED: $26,558*

GRANTEE : Rhode Island Dept. of Health
Providence, Rhode Island

WITHDRAWN: $ 2,337.42

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
PHS	FY-66	$12,020*			
Grantee		12,020		$ 1,095.69	$1,924.31
		$24,040		1,095.70	
				$ 2,191.39	
6/1/67 -12/31/68 - 02					
PHS	FY-67	$ 2,438*			
		9,000	Carry-over		
Grantee		$11,438	Total PHS	$11,024.89	$ 413.11
		11,438		11,024.90	
		$22,876		$22,049.79	
1/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 03 (Renewal)					
PHS	FY-69	$ 3,025*			
	FY-69	9,075*	(03S1)		
		$12,100			
Grantee		12,100			
		$24,200			

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Personnel Budget		$16,118	$17,092

South Carolina

A. Population represented: 2,603,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. More intensive surveys were conducted in a representative rural and representative urban county.
3. Prepare a review draft of the State solid waste management plan.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Intensive program to technical assistance to communities and counties.

D. Project Description:

The State survey has been completed and has resulted in considerable interest from local officials throughout the State. Consequently, the State solid waste program has been continually requested to prepare local solid waste plans for communities whose problems demanded immediate attention. This local activity has resulted in diversion of resources from State planning. However, a State plan has been in preparation for the past year. The plan is about 25 percent complete.

SOUTH CAROLINA

TOTAL AWARDED: $136,888*

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00017

WITHDRAWN: $ 40,568.40

GRANTEE : South Carolina State Bd. of Health
Columbia, South Carolina

FISCAL HISTORY:			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-66	$35,000*	$32,462.86	$2,537.14
	Grantee		35,000	32,834.79	
			$70,000	$65,297.65	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02					
	PHS	FY-67	$57,794*	$19,762.74	$38,031.26
	Grantee		57,794	29,949.14	
			$115,588	$49,711.88	
6/1/68 -12/31/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-68	$44,094*		
	Grantee		44,094		
			$88,188		

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	3	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -	2	
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	2	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		3
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		2
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% L - - -	1	

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$32,939	$49,569

South Dakota

A. Population represented: 674,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. The Statewide survey is nearly complete.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Develop the State solid waste management plan.

2. Establish guidelines for a training course in solid waste management at the local level.

D. Project Description:

South Dakota is presently conducting its Statewide survey of solid waste practices. In addition, extensive public relations activities and coordination with other governmental agencies are underway. Further activities include guidelines development for a pilot program for an area-wide training course in solid waste management at the local level.

SOUTH DAKOTA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00040

TOTAL AWARDED: $31,801*

GRANTEE : South Dakota State Dept. of Health
Pierre, South Dakota

WITHDRAWN: $ .84

(Restricted to 03 - $1,637)

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/68 - 8/31/69 - 01					
	PHS	FY-68	$15,274* (Amended)	$13,636.16	$ .84
	Grantee		15,274	13,636.61	
			$30,548	$27,272.76	
9/1/69 - 8/31/70 - 02					
	PHS	FY-70	$16,527*		
	Grantee		16,527		
			$30,054		

Future support recommended -
03 yr. $15,870

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	17	17
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$25,300	$28,004

Tennessee

A. Population represented: 3,888,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. New State solid waste legislation.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.
2. Conduct a special study on the abandoned automobile problem.
3. Develop a model solid waste management plan for a county.

D. Project Description:

An extensive Statewide survey is complete having reached 99 percent of the State's population. Public relations and legislative efforts have been carried on since the beginning of the program with favorable results. For example, the new Tennessee Solid Waste Disposal Act authorizes the Health Department to promulgate rules and regulations, review plans for new facilities and organize a technical advisory committee.

Most of the data has been analyzed for the State plan and is 5 percent complete. The plan will be completed during 1970.

TENNEESEE

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00026

TOTAL AWARDED: $109,625*

GRANTEE : Tenn. Dept. of Public Health
Nashville, Tenn.

WITHDRAWN: $ 2,094.43

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED		ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
1/1/67 - 12/31/67 - 01					
PHS	FY-67	$18,230*			
Grantee		18,230		$14,502.16	$ .84
		$36,460		14,502.15	
				$29,004.31	
1/1/68 - 6/30/69 - 02					
PHS	FY-68	$22,841*			
		3,034	Carry-over		
		$25,875	Total PHS		
Grantee		25,875		$23,781.41	$2,093.59
		$51,750		23,781.40	
				$47,562.81	
7/1/69 - 6/30/70 - 03					
PHS	FY-69	$32,142*			
		693	Carry-over		
		$32,835	Total PHS		
Grantee		32,835			
		$65,670			
7/1/70 - 6/30/71 - 04 (Renewal)					
PHS	FY-70	$36,412*			
Grantee		40,571			
		$76,983			

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		2
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		4
	less than 50% - - - -	1	1
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget		$27,110	$58,723

Tennessee-Georgia Interstate (Chattanooga)

A. Population represented: 350,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the preliminary plan for solid waste management in the interstate region.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Gain acceptance of the plan and implement it.

D. Project Description:

This interstate region centered at Chattanooga, Tennessee, has completed its regional survey and a preliminary plan for solid waste management. Incineration was selected as the basic disposal method for the region. Collection, transportation, and overall system management was not examined in detail in this planning phase. Coordination between the Tennessee and Georgia solid waste agencies and programs was developed and maintained. These agencies provided a source of data, advice, and standards.

TENNESSEE-GEORGIA INT.

TOTAL AWARDED: $25,882*

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00042

WITHDRAWN:

GRANTEE : Chattanooga Area Regional Council
of Governments
Chattanooga, Tenn.

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/68 - 8/31/70 - 01					
	PHS	FY-68	$25,882*		
	Grantee		25,883		
			$51,765		

Future support recommended-
02 - $2,405

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	1	
Personnel Budget		$8,000	

Texas

A. Population represented: 10,873,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. Strong coordination with local and regional planning agencies.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.
2. Survey the State's industrial solid waste.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey is complete and the State plan development is underway. There has been a close relationship with "701" local planning assistance and the solid waste program which has been advantageous in comprehensive plan coordination.

For planning purposes, the county has been delineated as the basic unit. This delineation corresponds with those of councils of government and various regional designations. Other planning activities have included public relations and information.

TEXAS

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00031

GRANTEE : Texas State Dept. of Health
Austin, Texas

TOTAL AWARDED: $ 62,125*

WITHDRAWN: 1,360.00

FISCAL HISTORY:

		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
1/1/67 - 12/31/67 - 01				
PHS	FY-67	$27,806* (Amended)	$ 3,834.40	$ .60
Grantee		27,806	9,049.59	
		$55,612	$12,883.99	
1/1/68 - 12/31/68 - 02				
PHS	FY-68	$12,945*		
		21,210 Carry-over		
		$34,155 Total PHS	$24,770.00	$1,360.00
Grantee		34,155	29,335.00	
		$68,310	$54,105.00	
1/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 03				
PHS	FY-69	$21,374*		
		10,786 Carry-over		
		$32,160 Total PHS		
Grantee		32,160		
		$64,320		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -	2	3
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		1
	less than 50% - - - -	9	3
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		1

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$39,956	$35,392

Utah

A. Population represented: 1,022,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. The State survey is nearly complete.
2. Completion of an outline for the State solid waste management plan.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Employ more personnel.
2. Complete the State plan.

D. Project Description:

The Statewide survey is nearly complete. Once completed, steps can be taken to begin development of a plan outline and formulation of a State solid waste management plan. Difficulty in obtaining staff has contributed to delays in completion of this project.

UTAH

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00033

TOTAL AWARDED: $24,627*

WITHDRAWN: $ .03

GRANTEE : Utah State Dept. of Social Serv.
Salt Lake City, Utah

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 01				
PHS	FY-68	$ 9,298*	$3,929.97	$ .03
Grantee		9,341	4,390.56	
		$18,639	$8,320.53	
9/1/68 - 6/30/69 - 02				
PHS	FY-69	$ 3,541*		
		5,368 Carry-over		
	FY-69	163* (02S1)		
		$ 9,072 Total PHS	$ 9,072.00	$ -0-
Grantee		9,086	10,675.78	
		$18,158	$19,747.78	
7/1/69 - 6/30/71 - 03				
PHS	FY-69	$11,625*		
Grantee		11,642		
		$23,267		

BACKLOG: FY-71
03 yr. Admin. Supplement
for $4494

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	7	5
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -		
Personnel Budget		$15,989	$19,717** 7/1/69 - 6/30/70**

Vermont

A. Population represented: 416,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. A three-year solid waste planning grant project has been approved for the State by the Public Health Service.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Hire a staff for the project.

D. Project Description:

The State survey has not started because staffing problems have temporarily delayed all work. Hopefully, a full-time solid waste planner will be recruited soon.

VERMONT

TOTAL AWARDED: $23,830*

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00047

WITHDRAWN:

GRANTEE : Department of Health
Burlington, Vermont

FISCAL HISTORY:		AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
			Withdrawn
7/1/69 - 9/30/70 - 01			
PHS	FY-69	$23,830*	
Grantee		23,830	
		$47,660	

Future support recommended -
02 - $23,680
03 - $24,250

STAFF:		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	10	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -	12	
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget $31,780

Virginia

A. Population represented: 4,533,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. Completion of solid waste disposal plans for most of the counties and communities in the State.
3. Distribution of a bimonthly newsletter.
4. Formation of a special legislative committee to study the State's solid waste problems.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State solid waste management plan.
2. Develop a more extensive program of technical assistance.

D. Project Description:

Plans for the disposal of solid wastes during the next 20 years have been prepared for 75 percent of Virginia's counties, cities and towns. Data for this planning was obtained through the Statewide survey. Regulations will not be promulgated for some time but disposal standards have been distributed widely. A special legislative committee is studying the State's solid waste problem and will report its findings to the 1970 Assembly. A bimonthly newsletter promotes better solid waste practices to its 700 subscribers.

VIRGINIA

GRANT NO.:	G05-EC-00003	TOTAL AWARDED:	$105,642*
GRANTEE :	Virginia State Health Dept. Richmond, Virginia	WITHDRAWN:	$ 1.56

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$36,188*	$ 9,336.20	$ .80
	Grantee		36,948	15,627.00	
			$73,136	$24,963.20	
9/1/67 - 8/31/68 - 02					
	PHS	FY-68	$11,441*		
			26,839 Carry-over		
			$38,280 Total PHS	$24,751.24	$ .76
	Grantee		44,412	24,884.00	
			$82,692	$49,635.24	
9/1/68 - 9/30/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-69	$24,447*		
			12,501 Carry-over		
		FY-70	33,566*		
			1,039 Carry-over		
			$71,553 Total PHS		
	Grantee		84,770		
			$156,323		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	3	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -	2	
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		1 (Various Sanitarians)
	less than 50% - - - -	2 (Various Sanitarians)	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		2
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		2
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	1
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

	INITIAL	CURRENT
Personnel Budget	$55,336	$53,925** 9/1/69-6/30/70**

Washington

A. Population represented: 3,089,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. New State Department of Ecology which includes solid waste, air and water pollution control responsibilities.
3. Prepare major portion of guidelines for local and regional solid waste planning.
4. Increased staffing.
5. State plan is underway.
6. Local and regional grants-in-aid program.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete Phase I of the State solid waste management plan.
2. Administer State grant-in-aid funds for local solid waste planning.

D. Project Description:

Washington's Statewide survey is complete with much of the basic data assembled and analyzed. Public relations and information and legislation efforts have been successful. In early 1970, the Legislature passed a bill sponsored by the Governor to combine solid waste, air, water in a new Department of Ecology.

The State plan is 60 percent complete with completion scheduled for October 1970. This Phase I plan will include guidelines for local and regional planning. The solid waste agency will administer grant-in-aid funds for local solid waste plans using these guides.

Additional planning work for Phase II and III plan will consider industrial and agricultural solid waste.

WASHINGTON

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00004

GRANTEE : WASHINGTON

TOTAL AWARDED: $82,016*

WITHDRAWN: $ 92.55

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
9/1/66 - 8/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-67	$20,000*	$11,941.45	$ 92.55
	Grantee		20,756	21,611.19	
			$40,756	$33,552.64	
9/1/67 - 10/31/70- 02					
	PHS	FY-68	$24,332*		
			7,966 Carry-over		
		FY-70	11,470* (02S1)		
		FY-70	26,214* (02S2)		
			$69,982 Total PHS		
	Grantee		93,416		
			$163,398		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	2	4
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		1
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		1 (3 mos.)
	less than 50% - - - -	11	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	1
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget	$30,169	$43,461**
		3/1/70 - 10/31/70**

West Virginia

A. Population represented: 1,798,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

1. Completion of the Statewide survey.
2. Propose a State solid waste law.
3. Prepare an outline for the State solid waste management plan.
4. Attain a substantial State budget .

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

1. Complete the State plan.
2. Increase the public educational and local training activities.

D. Project Description:

Data from the state-wide survey is now being analyzed. The grantee prepared several county solid waste plans which have been implemented. A proposed solid waste law could not be accommodated by the 1970 Legislature's schedule, and the bill will be resubmitted at next year's session. Public education continues to be one of this agency's most important activities. The State Plan is 20 percent done and will be finished by September 1970.

WEST VIRGINIA

GRANT NO.: G05-EC-00002

TOTAL AWARDED: $85,434*

GRANTEE : West Virginia State Dept. of
Health
Charleston, W.Va.

WITHDRAWN: $ 616.11

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE	Withdrawn
6/1/66 - 5/31/67 - 01					
	PHS	FY-66	$15,412*	$13,138.73	$ .27
	Grantee		15,412	15,390.45	
			$30,824	$28,529.18	
6/1/67 - 5/31/68 - 02					
	PHS	FY-67	$26,700*	$16,993.16	$ 615.84
	Grantee		26,700	26,143.17	
			$53,400	$43,136.33	
6/1/68 - 10/31/70 - 03					
	PHS	FY-68	$15,336*		
			11,364 Carry-over		
		FY-69	2,700* (03S1)		
		FY-69	4,214* (03S2)		
		FY-70	21,072* (03S3)		
			$54,686 Total PHS		
	Grantee		54,686		
			$109,372		

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	4	3
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		2
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -	1	2
	75% - 99% - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
-----------------------			1 (Janitor-50%)
Personnel Budget - 6/1/69 -5/31/70		$39,630	$58,696**

Wyoming

A. Population represented: 315,000*

B. Critical events through 3/1/70:

   1. Initiate the Statewide survey of solid waste practices.

C. Critical events forecast to 7/1/71:

   1. Complete the State survey.

   2. Begin developing the State solid waste management plan.

D. Project Description:

One of the newest solid waste management planning grantees, Wyoming is in the process of conducting its state-wide survey of solid waste management practices in association with the State's natural resource and planning agency. This coordination will have long-term benefits in that solid waste plan recommendations will have a greater likelihood of being implemented along with other State comprehensive plan proposals.

WYOMING

GRANT NO.:	G05-EC-00043	**TOTAL AWARDED:**	$14,224*
GRANTEE :	Wyoming Dept. of Health and Social Services Cheyenne, Wyoming	**WITHDRAWN:**	

FISCAL HISTORY:

			AWARDED	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES - ROE
6/1/68 - 11/30/70 - 01				Withdrawn
	PHS	FY-68	$14,224*	
	Grantee		14,224	
			$28,448	

STAFF:

		INITIAL	CURRENT
Professional:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -	1	
	less than 50% - - - -	4	
Technical:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 75% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		
Secretarial:	100% - - - - - - - - - -		
	75% - 99% - - - - - - -		
	50% - 74% - - - - - - -		
	less than 50% - - - -		

Personnel Budget $6,427